

Book Reviews

Melissa Ames (ed.), *Time in Television Narrative: Exploring Temporality in Twenty-First-Century Programming*. University Press of Mississippi, 2012. ISBN 978-1-61703-293-6

Paul Booth, *Time on TV: Temporal Displacement and Mashup Television*. Peter Lang, 2012. ISBN 978-1-4331-1569-1

Paul Booth's monograph and Melissa Ames's anthology take as points of departure a common idea. Booth: '[t]he past decade has seen an increase in the type, frequency, and visibility of television narratives that utilize "time" in unusual and non-traditional ways' (p. 1). Ames: 'never before has narrative time played such an important role in mainstream television' (p. 9). How does each account further elaborate the nature of the change it posits and explain that change?

Ames's 310-page anthology offers twenty-one chapters (plus an introduction), almost all of which use one, two or three recent US television programmes as case studies. The first of five subsections considers the relationship between the US television industry and the aesthetics of its products; the final one explores 'Fan Fiction, Online Communities, and Audience Studies'. The second subsection, in which 9/11 looms large, considers 'How the Cultural Climate Impacts Temporal Manipulation on the Small Screen'. The remaining two have a more purely formal focus: 'The Functions of Time: Analyzing the Effects of Nonnormative Narrative Structure(s)' and 'Moving Beyond the Televisual Restraints of the Past: Reimagining Genres and Formats'. Many contributions offer vivid, insightful accounts of the effects achieved by the temporal manipulations of the programmes explored. However, the brevity of each contribution means the burden of exposition (a problem for television that becomes a problem for television studies) is often felt; not long after the dense and intricate web of context has been sketched, it is time to proceed to the next chapter. Booth's book suffers less from this burden, both because it is a monograph and because he focuses on fewer programmes in more depth.

Both books owe a debt to Jason Mittell's ongoing work concerning what he terms the 'complex TV' that has emerged on US television in the past decade or so.¹ Unfortunately, neither account matches Mittell's careful contextualisation and qualification of his model. Mittell demonstrates convincingly that there is a pronounced tendency for a strand of US serial drama to construct long-running puzzles, thus creating an 'operational aesthetic' and encouraging 'forensic fandom'.² However, this is only one species of 'complexity', and it should not blind one to others offered throughout television history by, for example, anthology drama, mini-series, and, yes, soap opera. In these books' eagerness to celebrate the (real, significant) achievements of contemporary US television, what is often sacrificed is a fair estimation of the achievements, innovations and variety of earlier television, and the intelligence of its viewers. For example, from a range of Ames's contributors³: 'Post-network era television has challenged its viewers like never

before' (p. 29); 'Previously unknown to prime-time serial TV, the sustained thematic reflexivity of both *Battlestar* (2003–09)⁴ and *Lost* (2004–10)⁵ is profoundly elegant' (p. 59); 'most shows produced during the era of TV I belonged to genres such as the soap opera, the situation comedy, and the crime show' (p. 103). And from Booth: 'new media has encouraged "more intellectually demanding" viewers – audience members whose intellects have been stimulated and advanced by the demands that new media places upon them' (p. 220).

Each book seeks to explain the handling of time in contemporary television in relation to a broader culture context. In Ames's anthology (as is often the case with edited collections), not only the case studies but the causal explanations offered are heterogeneous, offering the reader a range of perspectives to consider:

this collection suggests that the influx of television programs concerned with time may stem from any and all of the following: recent scientific approaches to temporality, new conceptions of (post)history, and trends in late-capitalistic production and consumption. These programs could also be viewed as being products of the new culture of instantaneity [...] or of the recent trauma culture amplified in the wake of the September 11 attacks. (p. 9)

Booth, by contrast, focuses much more on a single factor that he suggests is influencing contemporary television's treatment of time: namely, the emergence of 'transgenic media' – the label and particular inflection Booth wants to give to 'online/digital/social/new media [...] on which users can upload multimedia from a variety of sources' (p. 8). In certain respects, Booth is careful and circumspect concerning the scope of his argument. He repeatedly and explicitly disclaims any attempt to posit a straightforward causal relationship between the aesthetics of contemporary television and the communicative affordances of transgenic media. This has the effect, however, of limiting the value of Booth's intervention. The underlying factors that might explain the co-emergence of 'temporally complex narrative' and transgenic media tend to be referred to vaguely ('a cultural focus on issues of complex temporality') (p. 116). One can detect, however, an implicit technological determinism subtly at work in Booth's phraseology: 'digital technology has *revealed and built* vast networks of people' (p. 4); '[d]igital technology and transgenic media are *creating* a networked understanding of human relationships' (p. 192); 'with the massive influx of new technology comes societal changes' (p. 203) (my emphasis in both cases).

Ultimately, Booth's argument appears to be (to borrow a phrase from David Bordwell and his intervention in an analogous debate) a 'habits and skills'⁶ argument: a prevailing cultural context encourages particular habits and skills in its members; the same habits and skills that we deploy when using transgenic media are being traded upon by people who produce and consume contemporary television; this is what makes it illuminating and legitimate to place the two alongside one another (Booth's principal argumentative and rhetorical strategy).

This is fair enough, and often it yields valuable insights. The highlight of Booth's book is the fifth chapter, in which *Doctor Who* (1963–present)⁷ and its rewriting of history are placed alongside that particular type of web-text called the wiki. However, often the analogies are less felicitous. In little more than an aside, Booth tries to compare the 'adult relationships with [...] parents' made possible by time travel in *Life on Mars*

(2006–7)⁸ and *Ashes to Ashes* (2008–10)⁹ with ‘see[ing] our parents in a new light’ through our social media interactions with them: ‘We flip through a Picasa account instead of travelling in time, but the impetus is similar’ (p. 92). ‘*Lost*’s social network’, Booth asserts, ‘mirrors *precisely* [emphasis added] the social network we have in our own lives. We only know certain things about characters; we only know certain things about our friends online’ (p. 191). These analogies often feel undermotivated because one can replace either of the pair of terms with instances that come before Booth’s period of interest, thus undermining the pointedness of making the comparison in the first place. Instead of a ‘Picasa’ account, why not one’s parents’ old letters or photograph albums? The description meant to tie *Lost* ‘precisely’ to our (implicitly, online) social networks is true of almost all narratives: characters interact in complex ways and we do not know everything about them. The social networks of Charles Dickens’s *Bleak House* (1852–53)¹⁰ and Max Ophuls’s 1950 film *La Ronde*¹¹ mirror, more or less, the social networks we have in our own lives.

These two books, then, offer bold, intriguing and multi-faceted arguments about the relationship between contemporary television and broader cultural approaches to time, which are profitable to think through. They also, and especially, offer good close engagements with a broad range of contemporary US (and, in Booth’s case, British) television programmes. However, both are significantly hampered in their own ways by the claims they make regarding those programmes’ particular historical place and specificity.

James Zborowski
University of Hull

Notes

- 1 Jason Mittell, *Complex TV: The Poetics of Contemporary Television Storytelling*, Media Commons Press, 2012–13, <http://mediacommons.futureofthebook.org/mcpress/complextelevision/>, accessed 8 August 2013.
- 2 *Ibid.*
- 3 Contributors quoted here are Todd M. Sodano, ‘Television’s Paradigm (Time)shift: Production and Consumption Practices in the Post-Network Era’; Jordan Lavender-Smith, ‘“It’s Not Unknown”: The Loose- and Dead-End Afterlives of *Battlestar Galactica* and *Lost*’; Aris Mousoutzanis, ‘Temporality and Trauma in American Sci-Fi Television’, respectively.
- 4 *Battlestar Galactica* (BSkyB/David Eick Productions/R&D TV/Stanford Pictures/UMS/Sci-Fi Channel, 2004–9).
- 5 *Lost* (ABC Studio/Touchstone Television/Bad Robot/Grass Skirt Production/ABC, 2004–10).
- 6 David Bordwell, *On the History of Film Style*, Harvard University Press, 1997, pp. 142–43.
- 7 *Doctor Who* (BBC, 1963–89, 1996; BBC Wales/BBC, 2005–present).
- 8 *Life on Mars* (BBC Wales/Kudos/BBC, 2006–7).
- 9 *Ashes to Ashes* (BBC Wales/Kudos/BBC, 2008–10).
- 10 See Caroline Levine, ‘Narrative Networks: Bleak House and the Affordances of Form’, *Novel*, 42:3, Fall 2009, 517–23.
- 11 *La Ronde* (Max Ophuls, 1950).

Murray Forman, *One Night on TV is Worth Weeks at the Paramount: Popular Music on Early Television*. Duke University Press, 2012. ISBN 978-0822350118

The history of the role of popular music on television is neglected within both popular music and television studies. Some key events, like Elvis Presley's 1956 appearance on *The Ed Sullivan Show*,¹ the birth of MTV in 1981, or the broadcast of *The X Factor*² from 2004 onwards, are signalled as significant in both fields, but we lack a detailed understanding of how music and television interact. More recent publications, like James Deaville's edited collection *Music in Television*³ and Ian Inglis' *Popular Music and Television in Britain*,⁴ have offered up interesting glimpses of how we might explore this interaction. However, neither these books comes close to the systematic ambition of Murray Forman's analysis of the cultural history of popular music on early American television.

Forman's scholarship is impressive, delving into a range of primary sources that run from the trade press to industry documents, to excavate a neglected story. At one level this is an analysis of key broadcasts, industry struggles and cultural conflicts within North American television. At another it is a sensitive reading of the place of both music and television within the shifting culture and economics of the post-war United States. Focusing primarily on 1948 and 1955 – from the point that television became a notable domestic medium to the point that it was utilised as a vehicle for selling a new generation of popular music stars – Forman explores in detail how the industry made sense of the role of music for a visual medium, how it represented America's diverse range of ethnically rooted popular music, and how a variety of other economic interests responded. Any study that can take in unionised musicians, jukebox and tavern entrepreneurs and broadcasting moguls and interpret their relative agency in a fast changing cultural production and consumption landscape is clearly coherent, broad and sophisticated.

There is room for musical and television stars like Desi Arnaz, Perry Como and Frank Sinatra, but also for Ira Ray Hutton, Hazel Scott and Dina Shore, all of whom had very different impacts on broadcast history. More importantly, though, Forman locates the changing broadcast form of television in wider socio-economic and cultural practices, and there are important chapters about both African-American and Latin music in television during this period. The 'look' of music is something that pervades Forman's book, and there is even a focused chapter on the way performers were expected to alter their performances for different purposes. Here the idea of commercial determinants is particularly strong, while elsewhere the author tends to emphasise a broader sense of struggle between emerging and previously dominant institutional power blocks within the entertainment industry. Less convincing was the section of the introduction that posits the idea of David Sarnoff as a broadcasting visionary foretelling the impact of television on the imagined music star. In reality, image was as important to a sound medium like radio as it was to a video form like TV. Pre-television audiences experienced the stars' popular music through a whole variety of media and personal encounters, and it is more useful to see television as the technological realisation of the imagined form of music performance than as a determining technology.

Musical and cultural labour are valuable critical ideas that run through the study, and a notion – explicitly explored in chapter 3 – of genre harmonisation is particularly productive; I would have liked to see some greater abstraction of these ideas into more general principles. Ideas of cultural incorporation and musical assimilation are addressed,

and generally dealt with through deft analysis and pretty rigorous attention to the evidence of the primary texts Forman has assembled to support his study. This is all set against an interesting discussion of the utopian and dystopian stories about television that were told by groups representing different vested interests, and the sense that no one really knew what the new medium could do and would become.

This book fills an important gap and sets out a model for study of the way television engages with music encoded in genres, patterns of gendered, ethnicised and economically organised forms that represented and spoke to key audiences in post-war America. It is an engagement with a number of key industries then already in a headlong process of integration and economic concentration, and with their executives, who were in thrall to, or fear of, the new medium. But it is also a detailed engagement with musicians, production processes and the expectations of audiences at home and in bars. This is certainly a book I would recommend to others who are interested in US television history and popular music, and I will encourage my students to read it. This could well become the model for studies of the early television of other nations, and a blueprint of method for those who are involved in writing about the later engagements of television and music.

Tim Wall
Birmingham City University

Notes

- 1 *The Ed Sullivan Show* (CBS/Sullivan Productions/CBS, 1948–71). Presley's appearance was on 28 October 1956.
- 2 *The X Factor* (Fremantle Media/Syco/Thames [formerly Talkback Thames]/ITV, 2004–present).
- 3 James Deaville (ed.), *Music in Television: Channels of Listening*, New York, 2011.
- 4 Ian Inglis (ed.), *Popular Music and Television in Britain*, Farnham, Surrey, 2010.

Anna Christina Pertierra and Graeme Turner, *Locating Television: Zones of Consumption*. Routledge, 2013 ISBN: 9780415509787 (hardback) ISBN: 9780415509794 (paperback).

I have to admit from the outset that I welcomed the arrival of this book through my door. As the authors suggest, there are so few texts that really attend to the practices of television consumption, at least perhaps since the 'golden age' of television audience studies of the 1980s and 1990s, in what might be called the 'Anglophone tradition'. *Locating Television* on the other hand can be read alongside Graeme Turner and Jinna Tay's 2009 collection, *Television Studies After TV*,¹ as a project in which the national and regional specificities of television are made central to critical analyses. In many ways the point is rather simple: *location, location, location*. But this book is more than a de-centring mission and more than a specific, singular, study of consumption. Its overall purchase on the field is about television as a vehicle for understanding variations in processes of modernity, and as such it is also an argument for television research at all.

How did we arrive at a place in television studies where the point about location needs to be made so boldly? The opening chapters attend to this question. The introduction reminds us of the debates circling in television about the 'death of TV' and its declining role in the social character of the nation. Technological changes: the multi-channel landscape; the move across alternative platforms; on-line delivery; global formatting; niche marketing; fragmenting of the audience; individualised scheduling and so on, mean that a good deal of research has been focused on the technological *process* of change at the expense of actual *experience* of television. This is a kind of 'de-territorialising' of television studies whereby location has been prematurely cast aside. The authors rightly suggest that, 'it is possible to argue that we know even less about the consumption of television and its role in everyday life today than we did during the broadcast era' (p. 15).

The book then comes at a time when there are renewed calls for more socially located empirical studies into consumption precisely because of the context of media convergence.² Thus Anna Perterra and Graeme Turner make the case for a way forward via a framework of 'zones of consumption' whereby insights into contingent practices of consumption around material culture can be achieved through the research tools of cultural anthropology, suggesting an infinity with the type of 'non-media-centric' media studies put forward by David Morley³ and, I would add, Shaun Moores.⁴ The authors argue for a research initiative whereby the various 'zones' that weigh upon the location of television in any particular space and time must be brought together to highlight their particular socio-cultural and *geo-political* conjuncture. These zones *might*, as they do in this instance, consist of the nation, the television industry, the local geography of place, or the intimate space of the home – all as they come to work themselves into, in varying degrees, the practices and routines of everyday life.

The authors begin this journey by re-visiting the conceptualisations of 'nation' and 'community' (in chapters 2 and 3) and how they have been re-cast in the post-broadcast era. Convergence culture has tended to see the nation as a regressive formation in the globalised on-line environment, whereas in taking a close look at the Mexican landscape with its well-developed television economy, the nation is still of primary significance. The dominant player, Televisa, relies on Mexican products even as they pursue globalised trade in a type of 'commercial nationalism'. It has also maintained a stable scheduling structure whilst cable and satellite providers have been introduced, re-affirming a type of familiar national consciousness around what constitutes Mexican television. This chapter reminds us of the need for caution in making assumptions about globalisation and culture based on the movements of capital and trade. Often precisely because of strategic engagements with internationalism, the national can be re-asserted, because there are numerous ways through which, 'television performs the task of constructing national subjects' (p. 59).

The discussion in chapter 2 around the nation may give the impression that there was ever consensus about the relationship between the nation, state and television in the broadcast era; it is a relationship that has increasingly been mythologised because of the new media landscape. But chapter 3 also points to another term which has been subject to some fictive license – the concept of 'community'. They critique the broader argument that the individualising of viewing practices undermines the notion of television communities. These are arguments that also tend to presume that forms of community have migrated on-line and thus wrestled free from any need to understand 'place'. But for Perterra and Turner the term community itself needs some reinvestigation, as it is

discursively loaded with nostalgia. After all, television and social media share the central features of liveness, sharedness and immediacy, and so for the authors the continual dispersal of 'niches' of both types of media consumption only make the notion of zone and its insistence upon contingency *more* central.

By chapter 4 we get to the ethnographic research – a study of the aspirational middle-class community of Chetamal, Mexico – where the data is presented as a series of case study cameos of television consumption practices. The authors put to work Roger Silverstone, Eric Hirsch and David Morley's⁵ theorising of the 'moral economy' of domestic consumption, arguing that it is the 'economic and emotional viability of the household that determines how well or how poorly media may integrate into everyday life, more than the inherent qualities of media technology or even the political or industrial structures that shape what media is available' (p. 100). Here Pertierra and Turner describe the way in which the Chetamal residents value the nature of television viewing in the family home, even when it is through multiple television sets in different rooms, because of a particularly localised consciousness around domestic leisure and security. This finding is contextually understood in relation to what Theresa Caldera⁶ calls, in the Brazilian context, an 'ideology of fear', whereby public space, the street is marked as a space of violence and danger. Therefore the type of 'bunkering down' of the family in the home in this suburban context is not only a marker of aspiration, but also a site for the safe, comfortable and importantly *legitimate* place of leisure which affords a particular kind of freedom.

These insights are intriguing and I would have welcomed the fieldwork's more direct infusion into the other chapters. For instance, the next chapter 'TV and the Desire for Modernity' describes how television has almost universally been adopted as a signifier of modernity⁷ whilst at the same time that symbolic formation is nationally and locally specific. Modernity may indeed have a recognisable repertoire of symbols but the way in which those symbols are weighted and configured varies greatly from place to place. Pertierra and Turner argue that it is politically important to recognise this so that we as scholars do not imply a colonising narrative of modernity as progress. Intriguingly much of the work they use to describe such geo-political articulations is about the negotiation of particular television texts: for instance Marwan Kraidy's research⁸ on how reality television draws out ambivalences around modernity in Arab nations.

Particular texts do not play a great part in the authors' analysis of television viewing in Chetamal, and that has always been my slight anxiety over the proposition of 'non media-centric' media studies. Yet to me what connects these different textual and ethnographic accounts is the degree of emotional investment that television invites as both storyteller and as material culture. Emotions frame the broader moral economies that pervade all our interactions around television, as well as those within the research environment. I am intrigued to know more about the researchers' own engagements with the community in Chetamal, especially given the residents' absence from the streets. Exactly *how* is the *value* of individualised domestic television viewing being invoked by the residents in their own words? The authors make a direct comparison with Heather Horst's 2012 work⁹ whereby families in Silicon Valley replay negative concerns about children and 'segmentation' as presenting a moral danger, whilst also wanting to pursue technological education. How people speak of television tells us a good deal about the expectations of a culture – perhaps in the neo-liberal site of Silicon Valley, it might be telling of how investments in television must be verbalised as part of a broader productive account of self-knowledge. I wondered whether coming back to the voices of the

Mexican residents in this chapter might have further filled in that particular picture of the political-symbolic value of television in the Chetumal context.

The final chapter then describes the writing process – the various trade-offs in bringing together cultural studies approaches and cultural anthropology – positions that share many sympathies and yet have wrestled over the rules of ethnographic methodology. I think this book works precisely because of the cultural studies' inflection and the desire to get a critical purchase on a social-cultural 'conjuncture'. *Locating Television: Zones of Consumption* therefore is more than a plea for situatedness; it is a plea for recognising that television itself as a stubbornly significant site of socio-cultural analysis and I'd like to thank the authors of this book for giving me reason to carry on. . .

Helen Wood
University of Leicester

Notes

- 1 Graeme Turner and Jinna Tay (eds), *Television Studies After TV: Understanding Television in the Post Broadcast Era*, Routledge, 2009.
- 2 See for example Nick Couldry, 'More Sociology, More Culture, More Politics: Or a Modest Proposal for "Convergence" Studies', *Cultural Studies*, 25: 4–5, 2011, 487–501.
- 3 David Morley, *Media, Modernity and Technology: The Geography of the New*, Routledge, 2007.
- 4 Shaun Moores, *Media, Place and Mobility*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- 5 Roger Silverstone, Eric Hirsch and David Morley, 'Information and Communication Technologies and the Moral Economy of the Household', in Roger Silverstone and Eric Hirsch (eds), *Consuming Technologies: Media and Information and Domestic Spaces*, Routledge, 1992, pp. 15–31.
- 6 Teresa Caldera, *City of Walls: Crime, Segregation and Citizenship in Sao Paulo Berkeley*, University of California Press, 2000.
- 7 Although the mobile phone carries similar symbolic power in many places.
- 8 Marwan Kraidy, *Reality Television and Arab Politics: Contention in Public Life*, Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- 9 Heather Horst, 'Families,' in Mizuko Ito, Sonja Baumer, Matteo Bittanti, Danah Boyd, Rachel Cody, Becky Herr-Stephenson, Heather A. Horst, Patricia G. Lange, Dilan Mahendran, Katynka Z. Martinez, C. J. Pascoe, Dan Perkel, Laura Robinson, Christo Sims, Lisa Tripp (eds), *Hanging Out, Messing Around and Geeking Out: Kids Living and Learning with New Media*, MIT Press, 2012, pp. 149–58, http://mitpress.mit.edu/sites/default/files/titles/free_download/9780262013369%20_Hanging_Out.pdf, accessed 20 December 2013.

Darrell M. Newton, *Paving the Empire Road: BBC Television and Black Britons*. Manchester University Press, 2011. ISBN-10: 071908167X, ISBN-13: 978-0719081675.

Darrel Newton's *Paving the Empire Road: BBC Television and Black Britons* charts the historical relationship between the BBC's radio and television services and Black Britain.

Starting in the 1930s, the monograph is the first book-length 'institutional case study' (p. 4) of how the BBC has shaped and responded to this aspect of British cultural life.

Newton is a US-based academic who has spent several years investing research energy in this area. Television and its management of 'race' is a source of fascination for television studies because of the varying strategies of media inclusion and exclusion of black people that have been employed, and because of the themes of audiences, representations and cultural power that are raised. And yet since the 1990s and early 2000s, when we saw a broader turn towards questions of cultural representation and social identities, book publications in this area have remained rather thin on the ground. Of these, *Paving the Empire Road* is most comparable to Stephen Bourne's research in this area. And like Bourne's book *Black in the British Frame*,¹ Newton's is stronger on historical archival research than on textual or theoretical analysis.

Taken on these terms *Paving the Empire Road* assembles Newton's considerable research at the BBC Written Archive Centre and his consultation of written documents including memoranda, letters and corresponding policy decisions, along with programme transcripts and synopses. Newton contributes a nuanced approach that foregrounds internal developments and issues at the BBC and links texts with context – an endeavour that is at its richest when mapping the early post-war years that coincided with postcolonial immigration (Chapters 1 and 2). The images are also well selected and incorporated notably in Chapter 2 on 'Television programming and social impact' and Chapter 3 on 'Voices of contention and BBC programming'. The discussion of the 1950s and 1960s, when racial tensions were at a definite high following the uprisings in Notting Hill and Nottingham, is especially significant for demonstrating how the BBC managed that contested moment and how it affected editorial decision-making. The inclusion of radio (Chapter 1) when thinking about the BBC is also very welcome, given the significance of the BBC Empire Service and BBC radio's formative 'social eye' role.

As with any media history project, there are gaps (which Newton himself acknowledges in his Conclusion), but the author does a sound job of gathering relevant material evidencing how race has played a critical role in the BBC's history. However, the book does not present readers with a review of academic literature or a rigorous or critically engaged media analysis. So for example, the late Stuart Hall features on Newton's impressive list of interviewees and provides some valuable quotes from an interview that took place in 1997, but the author does not critically address Hall's own theoretical contributions to the field; seminal texts such as *Fable*² and the *Empire Road*³ of the book's title are analysed through programme notes, correspondence, synopses and pre-existing interviews, rather than semiotic or visual analysis. Newton's charting of this history really ends in the early 2000s, with the section on Greg Dyke and the BBC Black Forum (Chapter 5 'Contemporary voices from within'); for a book published in 2011 this seems premature, certainly given the emphasis on 'contemporariness'.

It is pertinent of course that many of the concerns that Newton highlights, around BBC policies and practices, audiences and the role of public service television in social and cultural life, are as pressing today as they were in the early part of the history that he conscientiously maps. For example, the author signals (mainly through the interviewees that are presented in Chapter 4, 'A Black Eye') the (still ongoing) tensions around the minority/majority approaches to public service programming, patterns of marginalisation and foregrounding, access and constraint. At times, these seem like very clear opportunities to explicitly connect the more robust analysis that is presented of the BBC's formative

years with the BBC of today. A thorough, independent analysis of current contexts, which recognises the significance of this media history, seems all the more pressing given the dearth of book publications in this area since the early 2000s.

As recently as October 2013, the BBC's most senior black executive, Pat Younge (the BBC's Chief Creative Officer until his resignation in 2013 and previously a series producer of current affairs programmes such as *Black Britain*⁴) discussed how the BBC is still not doing enough to provide programmes that black audiences are likely to find relevant. Younge highlights that although efforts have been put into employment and portrayal on screen in prime-time television, leading to some real gains, there remain significant problems both with storylines that tend not to resonate with black audiences, and with a white commissioning elite stronghold, given the lack of black, powerful decision-makers at the BBC (budget controllers, channel controllers and senior commissioners).⁵ The new BBC Director General Tony Hall has called for 'plans...in how we reach those audiences'.⁶

Just as these issues are still apparently on the agenda for the BBC (and industry) today, so they need to be for the academy and beyond. The relevance of Newton's work is in helping us to understand the historical circumstances that have led us to our current dilemmas around the role of public service broadcasting's management of cultural difference. Newton is clearly aware of this and yet this new publication is not utilised as strategically as it might have been: as one which starts to unearth some of the deep anxieties and sociological tensions at the heart of public service broadcasting in a (now apparently post-) multicultural society.

Sarita Malik
Brunel University

Notes

- 1 Stephen Bourne, *Black in the British Frame: Black people in Film and Television 1896–1996*, Cassell, 1998.
- 2 *Fable* (BBC/BBC, 1965).
- 3 *Empire Road* (BBC Birmingham/BBC, 1978–79).
- 4 *Black Britain* (BBC/BBC, 1996–68).
- 5 *The Media Show*, BBC Radio 4, 23 October 2013.
- 6 Tony Hall at Select Committee, 22 October 2013.

Aniko Imre, Timothy Havens and Katalin Lustyik (eds), *Popular Television in Eastern Europe During and Since Socialism*. Routledge, 2013. ISBN 978-0-415-89248-3

The label 'Eastern Europe' often serves the same purpose as a key in music: it sets not only the general mood but also the final chord. Observations of media systems, particularly television, in Eastern Europe almost always begin with descriptions of the institutional context. Still, the challenge is to look a bit further than a cursory glance at harsh restrictions on journalistic freedom and artistic creativity. In such a context, popular television is an extremely interesting and vital domain; however, the academic community

does not typically address it very enthusiastically or systematically, as the editors of this book note in their introduction. In this volume the question is not only about describing various genres of television content but also about explaining mechanisms of popularity in more general philosophical terms.

Popular Television in Eastern Europe During and Since Socialism is a collection of fourteen essays on socialist and post-socialist entertainment television as a medium, technology and institution. Studies of television systems in twelve Eastern European countries are provided. It is not an easy task to offer a detailed analysis of the important aspects of popular television in such a variety of national contexts. In some cases, analysis is limited to a general overview of television texts, giving only a brief production background, or is based on excerpts from the script. More extensive qualitative analysis is not conducted when it could have been. Also, in some cases empirical material seems to be too fragmental. Nevertheless, the collection can be considered a rich and inspiring ground for future studies.

The essays in this book sensitively trace themes specific to the Eastern European television context, demonstrating how changes arise through evolution rather than revolution, and disclosing the traditional dilemma of choice between continuity and interruption. Entertainment and popular content are based on specific cultural patterns, which are often resistant to institutional or political change. In Eastern Europe popular television in many cases facilitated the development of alternative discourses. Of course, cultural patterns function according to their internal laws; they can never be changed abruptly. Thus the process is rather evolutionary than revolutionary. It is interesting to learn how from the 1950s to the late 1980s socialist, state-run TV institutions took up elements of Western popular television. Power holders hoped to tame the masses with carefully chosen western tricks. At the same time, television professionals tried to find alternatives to communicate with people, to become popular, to become somehow a subject of democratic choice. Thus the media took on a vital role of mediator between power holders and audiences.

Any concept of popularity should take into consideration the specific interaction between content and the masses, for any public sphere encompasses more than just an institutional setting and political power game. There is always a public sphere – even in a very totalitarian society – and it interprets the content in its own way. Audiences share their own sets of collectively defined contexts and thereby create a cultural public sphere, which operates as an alternative to the institutional sphere. Thus, power holders can never completely control the mechanism of popularity. This gives rise to some interesting consequences. In Eastern European countries, news journalism was not that popular with the masses because it was the most controlled area of content production. It was much easier to censor factual texts than fictional texts, and audiences knew it well. Of course, power holders also closely monitored and managed the production of popular programmes, yet windows of opportunity still existed for mediating messages, feelings of unofficial solidarity and (to some extent) criticism against power holders. This book is effective in presenting several such cases.

For me, as an Eastern European, this book offers the pleasure of recognition. In my home country, Estonia, the development has been very much as the book outlines – that is, similar genres of popular television have dominated the televisual past, and the aftermath of history creates similar problems in the present. One can see why viewers in Eastern Europe still like old didactic adventure stories like the Hungarian *The Captain of The Tenkes* (1964)¹ (I remember it from my childhood) and television programmes such

as the absurdist Polish 'block of flats' series *Alternatywy 4* (*4 Alternative Street*) (1983–86).² Hidden between-the-lines criticism has often turned into nostalgia, which is an important ingredient of post-socialist memory. Some new hybrid forms of programmes like the Czech comedy-docudrama serial *Vyprávěj* (*Tell Me How it Was*) (2009–10)³ and everlasting family series such as the Hungarian *Szomszédok* (*Neighbours*) (1987–99)⁴ present ordinary people's lives intertwined with economic troubles and events that lead to personal transformation. It seems that East Germany is a slightly different case because it found itself in constant rivalry with West Germany's television programming and political and economic systems, and television was used for political indoctrination. The rivalry of the two Germanys was a usual storyline in different family series throughout the 1960s and 1990s, as revealed in the chapter 'An Evening with Friends and Enemies: Political Indoctrination in Popular East German Family Series', by Katja Kochanowski, Sascha Trültzsch and Reinhold Viehoff (pp. 81–101).

A couple of the essays offer thoughtful analysis of interesting aspects concerning minority cultures. In socialist countries, any detailed coverage of ethnic problems was avoided. After the establishment of a liberal media market, however, some stereotypes towards minorities have been exploited, often for reality series. Annabel Tremlett analyses children's opinions of Roma media stars (pp. 241–58). Ksenija Vidmar-Horvat observes polite, tolerant racism in which citizenship, belonging and membership are negotiated in the post-socialist world (pp. 259–73). In some cases, extreme comments have been treated as entertainment or as a professional journalistic judgement.

The ordering of the essays is logical. Opening essays examine the historical development of socialist television in various countries; then the liberalisation of TV program market and effects of globalisation are observed; finally the context of national identity is analysed. This history enables us to understand better the present situation in the region. In recent times, after the fall of communism, domestic state-controlled production was rapidly replaced by productions of Western origin. Interestingly, the number of channels technically available for television was very much the same on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Thus, the big wave of commercialisation with a sudden increase in the number of television channels came at almost the same time as in the Western part of Europe. National TV institutions were not alone anymore. They had to compete with new commercial channels for audiences and also for ideas meaningful for the public sphere.

Indrek Treufeldt
Baltic Film and Media School, Tallinn University

Notes

- 1 *A Tenkes kapitánya* (*Captain of the Tenkes*) (Magyar Televízió, 1964).
- 2 *Alternatywy 4* (*4 Alternative Street*) (Centralna Wytwórnia Programów i Filmów Telewizyjnych Półtel, 1983–86).
- 3 *Vyprávěj* (*Tell Me How It Was*) (Česká Televize, 2009–10).
- 4 *Szomszédok* (tr. *Neighbours*) (MAHIR/ Magyar Televízió Művelődési Főszerkesztőség, 1987–99).

Eduardo Cintra Torres, *A Multidão e a Televisão: representações contemporâneas da efervescência colectiva*, Lisboa, Universidade Católica Editora, 2013. ISBN 978-972-54-0381-5.

How are crowds represented by television? In *A Multidão e a Televisão* [tr. *The Crowd and Television: Collective Effervescence's Contemporary Representations*], a book written in Portuguese, Cintra Torres tries to answer that question. In this rich, solid and convincing study, the author draws upon a vast range of disciplines (philosophy, history, sociology, political theory, social psychology and communication studies) to stress how the crowd is linked to political representations, the relations between power and the people, order and chaos, collective behaviour, publicity, rationality and emotionality. While there are a number of well known works that deal both with the notion of crowd¹ and mob,² Cintra Torres's approach differs in that he specifically attempts to connect contemporary crowds and the social role of television broadcasting. Its novelty lies in the attempt to trace the ambiguous relation between present media societies and the constant emergence of the crowd in public spaces. Principally, he aims to access the meanings and symbolic forms of television texts, narratives and technical codes (p. 35) to understand how a multitude of configurations of the crowd manages to be a constant presence in television discourses. Thus, not only does the crowd manifest itself as television audience (talk shows, game shows), we also regularly see programmes such as news bulletins where the crowd is one of the main actors (for example, the birth and subsequent public display of Prince George by the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge).

Having more than 400 pages, *Crowd and Television* is divided into two parts. In the first half, Cintra Torres surveys classical theories on the crowd, starting with the ancient Greeks and Romans (Plato, Aristotle, Cicero) (p. 41), through the Middle Ages (Fernão Lopes, Machiavelli) (p. 51), until modern, mediated and networked societies (p. 207). *Crowd and Television's* first part goes, then, from the age of the crowds (Le Bon) to the age of the publics (Tarde) and underscores, as the author states, 'two great traditions: the Anglo-American tradition characterized by the deletion of the concept of crowd; and, with Le Bon, the European Continental tradition that puts it at the centre of the political constitution' (p. 41).

One of the most striking assumptions the book explores (in the first chapter) is, perhaps, Émile Durkheim's hidden agenda on the crowd. According to Cintra Torres, Durkheim has integrated the phenomenon of the crowd in his sociology without ever identifying it.³ Although in the late nineteenth-century '*les foules*' was a popular theme in academic discussion, Durkheim, it is contended, chose not to address the concept of crowd. While talking about 'collective effervescence' Durkheim does not refer to the mob or the crowd. Cintra Torres calls this the 'crowd's exnomination' (p. 87). What's more, Durkheim's sociological perspective on the crowd discards the psychological dimensions as purely emotional to emphasise the crowd's social function and its collective purpose. As Cintra Torres points out, 'developing an explanatory theory concerning what keeps societies united, Durkheim has incorporated the phenomenon of the crowd. He did not see it as an isolated occurrence but integrated in a structural conception where crowds fulfil functions that transcend them serving group survival interests, conceiving of crowds as part of society and not as a society, mistaken with mass society, in the vision engrained by Le Bon' (p. 99). Chapter 2 continues revisiting key authors that

directly or indirectly dealt with concepts of the crowd including Marx, Sigmund Freud, Ortega Y Gasset, Hannah Arendt or Canetti. This forms the background that takes Cintra Torres to consider, in chapter 3, crowds' affinities with performances and audiences. This is the part where the relation between crowds and modern culture is best achieved.

In the second part, the focus is on the empirical analysis of different representations of crowds as broadcast on television. Thus, Cintra Torres studies how a very diverse set of crowds is presented (and represented) on worldwide television (p. 213), undertaking the task of analysing political, musical, sports and Catholic crowds. Case studies are taken from European channels such as Radio e Televisão de Portugal (RTP), Music Television (MTV) or the British Broadcast Corporation (BBC), and include, for example, the political protests against globalisation,⁴ the professors' protests in Portugal⁵ or the 2005 World Youth Day.⁶ Each analysis is accompanied by several photographs illustrating, through still images, how television has portrayed and represented crowds. After the lengthy appraisal on crowd theory, the second, more empirical part is almost a book in itself. Although it starts with a historic contextualisation of the subject examined, its aims are eminently practical and pragmatic, functioning as an important complement to the first half of the book. Inspired by (among others) Selby and Cowdery,⁷ Cintra Torres gives notice of the different codes of the image – camera angle, composition, illumination, enactment and non-verbal communication – attempting to decode the complexity of television images of crowds. This strategy is also used in the study of the representation of the crowd attending the last concert of the 2004–05 BBC Proms.⁸ The book demonstrates how crowds inside and outside the Royal Albert Hall are a central element of the concerts. In addition, it shows that the television discourse (audio-visual and verbal) highlights the idea of nation and communion. In this context, union flags not only denote the patriotic dimension but also contribute to giving us an impression of a united, homogeneous, national crowd (p. 307).

Crowd and Television has some terminological problems. Even if it defines 'crowd' and 'multitude' in the very beginning (p. 19), the close proximity to terms like public, media audiences and mob provoke some confusion throughout the book. The analysis also leaves the reader with the impression that the concepts established in the first part are not fully worked through in the second. Nonetheless, the book has the strong merit of connecting crowds to media representations. It is based on a clear methodology that enables us to decipher the presence of crowds on television. Besides, it is the first Portuguese study surveying and assembling in one place all the historical evolutions and the scattered crowd theories, providing the reader with a more cohesive perspective on the subject.

In all, Cintra Torres achieves two things: first, an appreciation of the notion of crowd beyond its negative dimensions in contemporary societies. In fact, the crowd is here seen as a social structure able to compensate the experience of anomy (p. 354). Second, it relates the social prominence of crowds with its appearance on television. It seems that the media and the crowd are intertwined. One of the main values of this book, then, is that it raises a challenge to common assumptions about the crowd and forces us to consider the influence of television on the shape, development and identity of today's crowds. As such, *Crowd and Television* makes an important contribution not just to television and media studies, but also to sociology more widely.

This review is a CST/ECREA collaboration. It is available in Portuguese on *CSTonline*.

Samuel Mateus
Universidade Nova de Lisboa

Notes

- 1 Erika G King, *Crowd Theory as a Psychology of the Leader and the Led*, Mellen Press, 1990; David A Locher, *Collective Behavior*, Prentice Hall, 2001.
- 2 John McClelland, *The Crowd and the Mob: from Plato to Canetti*, Unwin Hyman, 1989; Peter Hayes, *The People and the Mob: the Ideology of Civil Conflict in Modern Europe*, Praeger, 1992.
- 3 See for example Émile Durkheim, *Selected Writings*, Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- 4 *TeleJornal* (RTP/RTP, 2002).
- 5 *Jornal da Noite* (SIC/SIC, 2008).
- 6 *Telejornal*, (RTP/RTP, 2005).
- 7 Keith Selby, Ron Cowdery, *How to Study Television*, Palgrave Mcmillan Limited, 1995.
- 8 *BBC Proms* (BBC, 2004, 2005).

New Articulations of Flow and Contra-Flow: The Landscape of Television Studies in and between Portugal and Brazil

In television studies in the Anglophone world, we see current foci on transnational movements of programming and content; the nature and characteristics of local television in specific countries and localities; close analyses of particular genres and programmes; changes in technologies, such as the upsurge of digital television (DTV) and the reappraisal of older television; and the dominance of US quality television. In the Lusophone world, these issues are not absent, but what we primarily see in Portuguese-language television studies are persistent questions of ownership, access and equality in modes of representation – questions that pertain to the very nature and the future of Portuguese-language television itself.

A review of the current landscape of television studies in the Lusophone world, and primarily in and between Portugal and Brazil, brings two concepts to the surface: flow and contra-flow. These are admittedly problematic concepts. They suggest not only stable constructs of nation but also the stable existence of national production systems and their circulation of television content, orders which are far from stable in the world of Lusophone television. Scholars of Portuguese-language television still contend with the fact that ‘contemporary cultural flows are regulated by a narrowly controlled global marketplace’.¹ However, they are also witnessing contra-flows, or ‘the institutional, cultural and political matrix of a world framed by processes of global power and local negotiation’, characterised by ‘politics of nations, individuals and cultures and negotiated through contestations of locality, nationality and global citizenship’,² within Portuguese-language television. Most evident in studies about the social, cultural, political and industrial dimensions of television in Portugal and Brazil is that contra-flow describes how

Brazil has long surpassed the peripheral relations it once held with Portugal. But the concept also describes an emerging set of relations concerning television in Portugal, Brazil and the larger Lusophone world.

While the books under review appear in English, some were simultaneously published in English and Portuguese. This selection allows us to see that Lusophone television studies are far from limited to the Portuguese-speaking world. Moreover, we can see that there has been a consistent effort to bring scholarship on Portuguese-language television to the English-speaking world. Eli Noam's 1991 *Television in Europe*³ offers a starting place for identifying how flow and contra-flow are redefined in the landscape of Portuguese-language television. His concise historical overview of Portuguese television predates important changes, such as market privatisation and deregulation and the introduction of new technologies and services. Nevertheless, Noam highlights the ways in which Portugal's political factions shaped its nascent television industry. Importantly, he also establishes the groundwork for understanding how Portugal's low levels of television production have led to its high reliance on Brazilian programming. Francisco Rui Cádima and Pedro Jorge Braumann⁴ provide a detailed analysis of the state of Portuguese regional television, namely in Madeira and the Azores, Portugal's Atlantic Ocean territories. Again, the authors highlight the dominant role the Portuguese government has played in the development of regional television, which, following EU membership, gave way to an open market dominated by RTP, SIC and TVI, Portugal's leading state and private broadcasters. Still, the authors foresee a further opening up of the Portuguese market to the advantage of regional broadcasters, which has been helped by government initiatives of plurality and diversification, but hampered by Portuguese television's monopolistic practices and by the lacklustre policies designed to tackle the country's low levels of media literacy in Western Europe.

Also writing in the 1990s, John Sinclair⁵ provides an account of how the privatisation of Portugal's television market allowed TV Globo, Brazil's dominant private network, to expand its content and services into Portugal and renew Portugal's dormant links with the Lusophone world. While TV Globo has capitalised on the privatisation of Portuguese television, Sinclair explains how, conversely, Portugal has increased its television presence in its other former colonies and its newer, diasporic communities in Europe and the United States through the Brazilian broadcaster. To update the landscape of Portuguese television studies, Vera Araújo, Gustavo Cardoso and Rita Espanha⁶ provide an overview of the history and present state of DTV in Portugal, highlighting, again, the government's roles in regulating the television market and, following the opening up of the DTV market around 2007, rapid changes in that particular landscape. Nonetheless, Portugal's monopolistic practices in the DTV market put it behind other European countries and illustrate how Portugal's television industry reflects that of Brazil.

Furthermore, Catarina Duff Bernay and Isabel Fernin Cunha⁷ (published in Portuguese and English) discuss how television fiction production reflects the larger industry in contemporary, financially burdened Portugal. The authors highlight four issues that have implications for understanding contemporary Portuguese television today. The first is the question of whether RTP should become fully or partially privatised, or offload its regional assets – again in Madeira and the Azores – to those provincial markets. Second, an influx of Angolan capital into Portugal's suffering television system has resulted in questions about the sources of those funds in relation to corrupt political figures. The third issue is that of Portugal's migration to digital terrestrial television (DTT), finalised in 2012, which

has led to allegations of corruption on the part of Portugal Telecom (the main beneficiary of the transition), more commercial and less quality national programming for rural viewers, and a dearth of free-to-air offerings. Finally, the authors note a switch in viewership of Brazilian fictional programming from TVI to SIC, making the latter of the two private broadcasters dominant in Portugal and reinforcing the contra-flow that Brazilian fiction represents in Portuguese television.

In transitioning from Portugal to Latin America and Brazil, we see a move towards questions and methodologies more typical in Anglophone television studies. Regional and national content and production systems become ways of shaping a comparative understanding of the role of television in a global, and not only a national, space, illustrated in the works of Jean K. Chalaby,⁸ Elke Weissmann⁹ and Andreas Fickers and Catherine Johnson,¹⁰ among others. Joseph Straubhaar¹¹ offers a particularly rich perspective on global television systems, incorporating cultural, industry, genre and audience studies. Straubhaar argues that audiences engage with television – and that television contributes to audiences' identities and cultural formations – on local, regional, national and global levels, with ample movement between these realms. Regarding Brazil and Portugal, Straubhaar discusses the contra-flow of Brazilian television to its former coloniser and much of the rest of the world. But he notes that 'national cultures, national markets supported by national governments, and national television networks still dominate the television viewing reality of most audiences',¹² an observation exemplified by TV Globo's dominant hold over Brazilian viewers. Similarly, Sinclair¹³ argues that, like the cultural dominance of US television in the English-speaking world, Mexico and Brazil are the main forces in television's Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking worlds, due not simply to the geographical concentration of Spanish-speaking Latin Americans or the populations of Mexico and Brazil, but rather to the global resonance of *telenovelas* in many countries without Spanish or Portuguese colonial links. Still, in the 'post-broadcast TV' landscape that characterises many parts of the world, Brazil and Mexico are steadfast reflections of, and Televisa and Globo are hugely successful due to, 'a regional media ecology in which deeply entrenched nationally based oligopolies continue to thrive'.¹⁴

The landscape of television studies in Brazil would be incomplete without considering television news research, not only because in Brazil news research lies outside of the remit of media studies or journalism studies (unlike in the United Kingdom or the United States), but also because Brazilian television news research interrogates crucial issues of ownership, access and equal representation – concerns endemic to Latin American society. While they only touch on Brazil, Claudia Boyd-Barrett and Oliver Boyd-Barrett¹⁵ offer a compelling study of the 24-hour television news industry in Latin America. Using traditional concepts from cultural studies of the hegemonic, subaltern and counter-hegemonic, the authors distinguish US-centred content that superficially covers Latin America (CNN), from content that caters to Latin American viewers but is underwritten by US interests (NTN24), from content that is legitimately concerned with Latin America but is heavily informed by an anti-US agenda (TeleSUR). In this terrain, the authors note that Brazil's news providers are often overlooked as a useful model, due to language barriers, but also to the self-sufficient nature of Brazil's news industry.

Given this backdrop, Mauro Porto's¹⁶ study of TV Globo's intervention into Brazilian political processes since the country's redemocratisation in 1985 is a timely, thoroughly researched and critically articulated work that, at its core, questions the very notion of political accountability. Porto illustrates the ambiguous role that TV Globo has played in

bringing the issues, voices and symbols of democracy to the Brazilian public forum. The main focus of the book is the Brazilian political arena and the ways in which Globo has thwarted or supported political figures and presidencies to maintain its hegemony, which includes aligning with popular interests. In response, Porto traces how media accountability movements – or ‘MAMs’ – have emerged to facilitate ‘recent changes in TV Globo’s patterns of representation in its fictional and informational programs’, the effects of which reflect TV Globo’s ‘response to a more organized and active civil society’.¹⁷ With a focus on news reporting and TV Globo’s problematic coverage of political candidates, the most interesting part of Porto’s book, incongruously, is devoted to how Brazilian television drama has brought to the surface and interrogated issues of diversity and inclusion in Brazil. These issues include ethnicity, gender, sexuality and geographical identities, which again, have been hampered and advanced by the overwhelmingly prominent role that TV Globo plays in Brazil.

Within themes of ownership, access and equality in modes of representation, it is also worth looking at how the concepts of flow and contra-flow inform studies of television fiction in Brazil. In their extensive research on the formal, thematic and industrial aspects of the *telenovela* through the OBITEL project,¹⁸ Maria Immacolata Vassallo de Lopes and Maria Cristina Palma Mungioni¹⁹ (published in English and Portuguese) highlight two current trends in Brazilian television fiction that they see as significant to understanding the larger contemporary landscape of television in Brazil. The first is that *Avenida Brasil* (2012),²⁰ a *telenovela* concerned with Brazil’s emerging middle class, reincarnated notions of the *telenovela* as ‘a major media event’ and ‘a narrative of the nation’,²¹ phenomena not seen since vastly successful productions of the late 1960s, 1970s and 1980s. The second is that Brazil has significantly increased production of television drama for subscription-based TV, a service historically dominated by American and European providers. This has implications, according to the authors, for ‘a historic opportunity to create a new standard of television fiction in Brazil’.²²

What we see in the landscape of television studies in and between Brazil and Portugal are new agents rearticulating new definitions of flow and contra-flow. First, the opening up of markets in Brazil and Portugal, both historically and recently, mean that government and private control of television is rapidly shifting. Whether we regard the privatisation of Portuguese television as beneficial or detrimental, or whether we see the expansion of Brazilian television production into subscription-based models as innovative or exclusive, what remains is that the once-uncontested powers of RTP and TV Globo are forced to respond to social, cultural and economic changes in their viewing populations. Second, in a landscape once informed by imbalanced relations between Portugal and its former and current territories, new agents such as Madeira, the Azores and Angola are redefining the provision, and financial backing, of television in the Lusophone world. Thus, scholars of television in the Lusophone world should continue to use the concepts of flow and contra-flow to interrogate new sociocultural and political-economic movements within their realms. Brazil has long surpassed reliance on Portugal for forms of television news or entertainment. What Brazilian television viewers are currently reckoning with is the ability to see their own identities and voices fairly expressed within the monolith of Brazilian television news and entertainment. Finally, television scholars outside of the Lusophone world should rethink the parameters of flow and contra-flow in their own particular landscapes, as such thought might reveal new producers, audiences or modes of production in spaces otherwise left unquestioned.

This review is a CST/ECREA collaboration. It is available in Portuguese on *CSTonline*.

Niall Brennan
Fairfield University

Notes

- 1 Anandam P. Kavoori, 'Thinking Through Contra-Flows: Perspectives from Post-Colonial and Transnational Cultural Studies', in Daya Kishan Thussu (ed.), *Media on the Move: Global Flow and Contra-Flow*, Routledge, 2007, p. 47.
- 2 *Ibid.*
- 3 Eli Noam, 'Portugal', in *Television in Europe*, Oxford University Press, 1991, pp. 252–55.
- 4 Francisco Rui Cádima and Pedro Jorge Braumann, 'Portugal: Analysis and Perspectives of Regional Television', in Miguel de Moragas Spà, Carmelo Garitaonandia and Bernat López (eds), *Television on Your Doorstep: Decentralisation Experiences in the European Union*, University of Luton Press, pp. 309–32.
- 5 John Sinclair, *Latin American Television: A Global View*, Oxford University Press, 1999, pp. 121–46.
- 6 Vera Araújo, Gustavo Cardosa and Rita Espanha, 'DTV in Portugal,' in Wendy Van den Broeck and Jo Pierson (eds), *Digital Television in Europe*, VUBPRESS, 2008, pp. 173–80.
- 7 Catarina Duff Bernay and Isabel Fernin Cunha, 'Portugal: Ficção e Audiências em Transição ['Portugal: Fiction and Audiences in Transition']', in Maria Immacolata Vassallo de Lopes and Guillermo Orozco Gómez (eds), *OBITEL 2013: Memória Social e Ficção Televisiva em Países Ibero-Americanos [Social Memory and Television Fiction in Ibero-American Countries]*, Editora Meridional, 2013, pp. 407–34.
- 8 Jean K. Chalaby, *Transnational Television Worldwide: Towards a New Media Order*, I.B. Tauris, 2005.
- 9 Elke Weissmann, *Transnational Television Drama*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
- 10 Andreas Fickers and Catherine Johnson (eds), *Transnational Television: A Comparative Approach*, Routledge, 2013.
- 11 Joseph D. Straubhaar, *World Television: From Global to Local*, Sage, 2007.
- 12 *Ibid.*, p. 7.
- 13 John Sinclair, 'Latin America's Impact on World Television Markets', in Graeme Turner and Jinna Tay (eds), *Television Studies After TV: Understanding Television in the Post-Broadcast Era*, Routledge, 2009, pp. 141–48.
- 14 *Ibid.*, p. 148.
- 15 Claudia Boyd-Barrett and Oliver Boyd-Barrett, '24/7 News as Counter-Hegemonic Soft Power in Latin America', in Stephen Cushion and Justin Lewis (eds), *The Rise of 24-Hour News Television: Global Perspectives*, Peter Lang, 2010, pp. 199–220.
- 16 Mauro P. Porto, *Media Power and Democratization in Brazil: TV Globo and the Dilemma of Political Accountability*, Routledge, 2012.
- 17 *Ibid.*, p. 146
- 18 OBITEL (<http://obitel.net/>).
- 19 Maria Immacolata Vassallo de Lopes and Maria Cristina Palma Mungioni, 'Brasil: A Telenovela Como Fenômeno Midiático' [*Brazil: Telenovela as Media Event*], in

Maria Immacolata Vassallo de Lopes and Guillermo Orozco Gómez (eds), *OBITEL 2013: Memória Social e Ficção Televisiva em Países Ibero-Americanos* [Social Memory and Television Fiction in Ibero-American Countries], Editora Meridional, 2013, pp. 129–66.

20 *Avenida Brasil* (TV Globo, 2012).

21 Maria Immacolata Vassallo de Lopes and Maria Cristina Palma Mungoli, 'Brazil: Telenovela as Media Event', p. 130.

22 *Ibid.*, p. 130.

Notes on Reviewers

Niall Brennan teaches in the Department of Communication at Fairfield University, Connecticut, USA. He is currently researching Brazil's emerging economic classes in Brazilian film and television, issues of global identity in media representations of Brazil and South Africa, and issues of representation in television programming oriented towards LGBT audiences.

Sarita Malik lectures in the Department of Sociology and Communications at Brunel University. Her research focuses on the politics of media communication, representation and institutional frameworks. She is the author of *Representing Black Britain: Black and Asian images on television* (2002) and several academic and journalistic articles on issues of race and representation.

Samuel Mateus is a Post-Doctoral Researcher in Centro de Estudos de Comunicação e Linguagens (CECL-NOVA University), benefiting from a Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia Scholarship. He currently teaches in Universidade Autónoma de Lisboa (UAL). His Ph.D. in Communication Sciences (NOVA University) dealt with publicity and society from a trans-disciplinary perspective. He is the author of *Publicity and Consummation in Contemporary Societies* (2011, in Portuguese) and *Tele-Reality: The Mediatized Principle of Publicity* (2013, in Portuguese), both free e-books available for download.

Indrek Treufeldt is Lecturer at the Baltic Film and Media School of Tallinn University, but is also a TV journalist in Estonian Public Broadcasting. From 2003–07, he was the permanent correspondent of Estonian TV in Brussels. He has produced numerous current affairs programs for Estonian Public Broadcasting (ERR) and currently has a weekly talk show on ETV. He received his Ph.D. from the University of Tartu with a thesis on 'Construction of Journalistic Facts in Different Societies'.

Tim Wall is Professor of Radio and Popular Music Studies, Associate Dean for Research in the Faculty of Performance, Media and English, and Director of Research in the Birmingham Centre for Media and Cultural Research, at Birmingham City University. His published research encompasses studies of

music and community media, jazz and popular music history, and digital transformations and online fandom. The second edition of his *Studying Popular Music Culture* was published in 2013.

Helen Wood is Professor of Media and Communication at the University of Leicester. She has published *Talking With Television* (2009); with Beverley Skeggs, *Reality Television and Class* (2011); and *Reacting to Reality Television* (2012). She is also Associate Editor of the *European Journal of Cultural Studies*.

James Zborowski teaches television, film, media and cultural studies in the School of Drama, Music and Screen at the University of Hull. He has recently published short pieces on the organisation of time in *The Royle Family*, and the representation of leisure, including leisure time, in recent British lifestyle television. Work in progress includes research on *Ghostwatch* and into how time works in *The Simpsons*.