

derlying assumptions of the system or the powerful analytic capacity that it has.

Nahumck is successful in this book to the extent that she introduces Laban's concepts and gives the reader some idea of the scope and conceptual power of his system. She clearly documents her belief, which I share, in the primacy of Laban's system as the most precise one available for analyzing movement in its own terms. The book is particularly useful for readers interested in a purely structural application of the notation system independent of the kinesthetic context, such as the comparative analysis of the steps of two related dance forms. A dancer looking for a shorthand for writing choreography would also find this book useful, as would a student of another notation system looking for comparative material. But it is only through rigorous study of Laban's work that its full potential for movement research can be realized.

References

- Birdwhistell, Ray
1970 *Kinesics and Context*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Gross, Larry
1973 *Modes of Communication and the Acquisition of Symbolic Competence*. In *Communication Technology and Social Policy*. G. Gerbner, L. Gross, and W. Melody. (eds.). New York: Wiley.
- 1975 *The Price of Progress, published as How True Is Television's Image? In Getting the Message Across*. UNESCO.
- Hackney, Peggy, Sara Mammo, and Muriel Topaz
1970 *Study Guide for Elementary Labanotation*. New York: Dance Notation Bureau, Inc.
- Hutchinson, Ann
1970 *Labanotation or Kinetography Laban: The System of Analysing and Recording Movement*. New York: Theater Arts Books.
- Kaeppler, Adrienne
1972 *Method and Theory in Analysing Dance Structure with an Analysis of Tongan Dance*. *Ethnomusicology* 16(2):173-217.
- Laban, Rudolf
1966 *Choreutics*. L. Ullmann (ed.). London: MacDonald and Evans.
- ——— and F. C. Lawrence
1947 *Effort*. London: MacDonald and Evans.
- Thorton, Samuel
1971 *Laban's Theory of Movement: A New Perspective*. Boston: Plays, Inc.

Barbara Rosenblum. *Photographers at Work: A Sociology of Photographic Styles*. New York and London: Holmes and Meier Publishers, 1978, 144 pp. \$19.50.

Reviewed by Dan Schiller

Centre for Mass Communication Research, University of Leicester; Temple University.

Barbara Rosenblum's illuminating study succeeds at tying photographic style in specific ways to the social organization of photographers at work. Style, she argues, is "a deposit of the work role" (p. 113). Moreover, "distinctive social processes dominate each setting where pictures are made and they affect what photographers can and cannot do, what kinds of images they can and cannot make, what kinds of visual data they can include in the picture or leave out" (pp. 1-2). The division of labor, technology, photographer-client relations, audience expectations, and control over work processes interact to fashion largely autonomous "worlds" (p. 19) of photographic custom and practice, worlds to which we gain entry via Rosenblum's report of her participant observation at three work settings. In her comparison of the ways in which news, advertising, and fine arts photographers make pictures, "the relationships between photographic style and social structure setting can be seen" (p. 2).

In these three spheres neophyte photographers are socialized into different work roles (what novices might know about picturemaking before this explicit socialization is not discussed). As apprentices, news photographers learn to be unobtrusive; they learn to anticipate sequences of social action so as to be able to plan their next shot; they internalize news values and learn to negotiate a fit between their pictures and the stories they may accompany. As assistants to established advertising photographers, newcomers learn to manage shooting situations: where to obtain special materials, how to make creases in satin look "right," how to keep models relaxed, how to take orders from agency art directors and clients. At school fine-arts photographers learn that photography is a visual art and that, somehow, their pictures should both unveil and bear witness to their own individuality.

We learn a good deal about the ways photographers go about their work. News photographers on the night shift generally cover different sorts of events than their colleagues on day work. Rather than the prescheduled events of day—press conferences, fashion shows, baseball games—at night "good human interest material. . . the birth of a baby . . . murder, fire, death" take precedence (p. 49). News photographs, too, often function as a record that

an event has in fact occurred. As one informant puts it: "With a picture, it's either there or not there. No bullshit. No reporter making up a story" (p. 22). "Getting the picture," if it is a good picture, means getting the story (p. 47); and the veracity of the photograph remains pristine even as the photographer is in practice subordinated to conventional journalistic storylines. In the similarly restrictive domain of the advertising photographer the chief job is to translate sketches supplied by advertising agencies into conventional photographic terms. Here creativity is seen to lie in "the solution to a technical problem for which there are no standardized solutions" (p. 84): how to shoot a toy castle underwater; literally, how to make the product shine. Advertising photographers thus derive concepts of creativity from their need to produce "original standard pictures" (p. 81)—photographs whose technical brilliance permits expression of the client's design. News photographers, however, may explain creativity in terms of a search for new angles when covering well-worn faces; and fine-arts photographers use creativity as a badge of their individuality by finding "original," often difficult or dangerous shots, or by printing in unexpected ways.

Style "is not the outcome of the history of the rules of a form" Rosenblum observes (p. 111), and her study reinstates a valuable empirical emphasis on the actual processes through which cultural forms are hammered out. If I find some problems with Rosenblum's conceptualization of style (which I will discuss below), they are secondary to her substantial contribution to our knowledge of the structured practices of photographers in American society.

We might have learned more from this book had a larger number of illustrations been included. A few photographs, chosen to exemplify broad stylistic differences between news, advertising, and fine-arts photography, find their way into the text. Yet there are many occasions where visual information is pertinent and some where the argument is damaged by its absence. The reader is too often shut off from good ethnographic data, and omission of illustrative resources obliges Rosenblum to shut doors which should have remained open. To take one major example, she states (p. 43) that "understanding the differences between newspapers, with regard to their definitions of the 'news,' is the first step in understanding the picture assignment process and the picture selection process." A paper's "general editorial attitude," she continues (p. 43), varies in accordance with "what news fits the image of the paper, and what kind of treatment of news items the editors think the readers expect of that paper." But what do these differences actually look like? How, specifically, does "general editorial attitude" impinge on the production and style of photographs, and how does its impact vary as one moves from journal to journal and from one end of the generic

style ("news photography") to another? Might not the tabloid and the prestige press, for example, diverge along a photographic dimension, as they so evidently do across conventional axes of content and visual form? Unaccompanied by photographic illustrations, Rosenblum's single example, a grisly murder, cannot provide an answer.

More serious, Rosenblum relinquishes any attempt to link such generic variation to the pattern of social stratification which pervades American society. Might not the styles of picturemaking employed by different newspapers be related to social structural differences between their publics? Can work practices not be seen as unfolding a graded series of photographic styles in relation to disparate audiences?

Rosenblum acknowledges that "the specificity of the audience" is a very important variable, one which is based on structural features of social systems" (p. 125). However, she then asserts that for news and advertising photographers a "primary audience" is comprised of "significant others," who make the "stop-and-go decisions along the distribution channel" (p. 118) and who, therefore, take analytic precedence over the "general public." In brief, the audience and its expectations are incorporated into the work organization itself: One produces for colleagues and editors, or for an ad agency art director and the client, rather than for any ultimate public. This is a valid and important argument, which has been developed at greater length in recent work on the production of news (Golding and Elliott 1979; Schlesinger 1978). It underscores the insight that in systems of industrial cultural production the interaction between producers and audiences tends to be uneven, with power held asymmetrically at the producing end. Nevertheless, it is worth pointing out that circulation and sales managers, with their market research staffs, are far from blind to the "demographics" which herald the interaction between style and audience penetration. Abolishing the audience by fiat segregates the newspaper from the context which, ultimately, underpins much of its cultural meaning.

Inattentiveness to the audience, therefore, allows style to become what it patently is not: a thing, "a deposit of the work role" (p. 113). As social structure disappears, work role and, by extension, style itself become pure expressions of organizational or institutional requirements.

In actuality differences exist between individual practitioners, or between subgroups, even in the most bureaucratic and routinized organizations—and these differences may be substantial. Among news people, for instance, Janowitz (1975) has argued that "gatekeepers" and "advocates" are disposed to project distinct journalistic styles: factual, objective, or neutral, on the one hand, and committed or partisan on the other. Cantor's (1971) study of Hollywood TV pro-

ducers is similarly able to isolate divergent types, the bases for which are sought in past career history and experience. Are there really no photographers at any of Rosenblum's three settings who *oppose* dominant concepts of creativity? Are there none who cling to alternative, but still acceptable, styles of picturemaking, be they residual or emergent (Williams 1973)? What are the patterns and bases of variation within the work role, and how do these interact with style?

Work role grants too much weight to the reality of an ideal typical photographer's experience. Not only does this tend to blur individual differences, it also accepts the perspective of the individual photographer as the most valid analytical standpoint. For the lone photographer working in a complex organization, however, much that may seem to be immutable may in fact be organizationally contingent. To imply, for example, that "technology"—in this case automated photographic processing equipment used by newspapers—does not encourage the news photographer to trouble about printing his own pictures, or to worry much about their final appearance, may be correct, but it obscures a somewhat different structural reality. As Rosenblum notes, it is *deadlines* that favor the use of high-speed photoprocessing equipment capable of churning out reproducible images in a matter of minutes. Deadlines, though, themselves express the newspapers' *economic* character. Contrary to Rosenblum's argument, news certainly is *not* the newspapers' "main product" (p. 41); news is news because it is necessary to have something to fill the space between the advertisements which are slotted *en masse*, in advance, into each day's projected paper (cf. Tuchman 1978:15–16). As Fazey (1977:6) explains, display advertising

is all-important in its effect on the type of newspaper that is produced. Advertising market considerations, in fact, create the large, multi-section newspaper, where the advertisers' perception of the editorial function is conditioned by the need to turn the reader onto the page which the advertiser has bought almost in its entirety. A three-quarter column turn from page A1 fills this need admirably.

Although "technology is always enmeshed in an economic, political and ideological system" (p.115), it is vital to ask and to find out how.

Reliance on work role is, finally, symptomatic of a troubling tendency to gloss over the fundamental distinction between collective and individual or craft production. Indeed, a number of crucial concepts—creativity, alienation, and style—are skewed uncritically toward individual rather than collective modes. Alienation, for example, is seen to result from a lack of control over work, from start to finish, from conceptualization to execution to ultimate audience reception. Well and good. "Control" itself, however, is

too automatically referred back to isolated actors: "... individual labor, not social labor, is a necessity for artistic production because it insures the possibility of working in a craft mode, in which thinking and doing are united" (p. 124). Why is such unity to be required only by artists? And might not thinking and doing ever be united in collective production? Rosenblum's answer is a retreat across a full century of practice and discussion. The use of craft production as an ideal points up fine-arts photography as a relatively attractive current style of work, and Rosenblum seems to insinuate that collective production itself may be the source of alienation, in the form of "aspects of modern work organization such as deadlines or routinization" (p. 124). Deadlines, I have pointed out, at least in newspaper offices, express a specific form of collective organization, and must not be confused with collective production per se; and it is far from clear in what ways routinization, taken alone, could engender alienation. Again, Rosenblum does not hesitate to assert, in support of fine-arts photography, that "unregulated competition may stimulate the creation of innovative imagery" (p. 120), because the free market, with its relatively diffuse expectations concerning works of art, permits "a greater possibility of imposing one's unique vision and one's own aesthetic preferences on a work of art" (p. 127). Has the author not permitted the obsessive concern for individuality evinced by many of her fine-arts photographers to dictate the boundaries of her own discussion? Diffuse expectations, in any case, are not identical to elastic or tolerant or far-ranging ones, as Rosenblum herself soundly shows: "... the strength of the market's influence is evident when we realize how few photographic traditions are defined as fine art, compared to the vast number of original portfolios that are submitted to curators and gallery owners each month" (pp. 108–109). Before she praised the free market, might it not have been advisable for her to find out what proportion of fine-arts photographs actually are sold through galleries and what proportion manage, in a not-so-very-free market, to elude these powerful arbiters of taste? How do we know that the diversity of style in fine-arts photography, along with the monolithic style of news photography, is not apparent only, a mere artifact of the author's enchantment with individual production and individual experience?

Three main weaknesses, therefore, afflict the concept of style advanced by Rosenblum. First, its stress on work role obscures our view of individual differences and, occasionally, structural constraints within organizations where photography is practiced. Second, style embraces neither generic nor inter-organizational variation nor, again, the distinction between individual and collective forms of production. Finally, the relationships between such variation and the social location of work practices are not examined;

style is not viewed as an interaction between organizations and the people outside them. Objections aside, however, *Photographers at Work* makes photography a more comprehensible practice.

References

- Cantor, Muriel
1971 *The Hollywood TV Producer*. New York: Basic Books.
- Fazey, Ian Hamilton
1977 Address to the IFRA Congress, Monday, October 24, 1977. Nice, France. (mimeo).
- Golding, Peter, and Philip Elliott
1979 *Making the News*. London: Longmans.
- Janowitz, Morris
1975 Professional Models in Journalism: The Gatekeeper and Advocate. *Journalism Quarterly* 52 (4):618-626.
- Schlesinger, Philip
1978 *Putting 'Reality' Together*. London: Constable.
- Tuchman, Gaye
1978 *Making News*. New York: Free Press.
- Williams, Raymond
1973 Base and Superstructure in Marxist Cultural Theory. *New Left Review* 82:3-16.

Michael R. Real. *Mass-Mediated Culture*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1977. xii 289 pp. No price (cloth).

Reviewed by Michael Intintoli
Burlington County College

Mass-Mediated Culture is a useful book, but perhaps not in the way the author intended. As an effort to synthesize a vast literature on a mass communication and culture, the book touches on a number of issues basic to the study of complex society and mass communication. In doing so, it demonstrates the importance of developing an anthropology of mass communication and media.

The book is an ambitious undertaking. In 280 pages Real proposes a theoretical framework for the study of mass-mediated culture, which he defines as "expressions of culture as they are received from contemporary media, whether they arise from elite, folk, popular or mass origins" (p. 14), summarizes much of the literature on mass culture, describes and justifies his methodology, presents several case studies, and exhorts the reader to create a setting in which the "liberating potential" of media could be realized. The core of his argument is that mass-mediated culture is a crucial link between the material setting and institutional structure of a society and the character of consciousness and symbol system of that society. To sup-

port and illustrate his contention Real presents case studies of Disneyland, the Super Bowl, medical programs on television, a Billy Graham crusade, a presidential campaign, and an Aymara fiesta in the Andes. He justifies this choice of topics, arguing that they are "focused on a specific event or person as a *dominant* and widespread cultural expression that *continues* over a period of years, represents a major *institutional* area or subsystem of society and is significant as an expression of a total cultural system" (p. 37).

In a brief section of three pages, Real describes the "methodologies" of functionalism, structuralism, and aesthetics and says that all three are necessary for an adequate understanding of mass-mediated culture. He then, just as briefly, characterizes his approach—without, however, integrating in any systematic way the proposed theory, methodologies, and research techniques. He labels his approach ethnographic, exegetical, typological, cross-cultural, critical, and policy oriented.

Ethnography. . . identifies an experience in exact detail together with historical and other necessary factual background. . . . *Exegis*. . . identifies the precise meaning of the experience both intensively in itself and extensively in its association. When well executed, the two define what an individual case *typifies* about a culture. The *cross-cultural* comparisons are most evident in the Aymara study, which compares and contrasts characteristic structures of a non-mediated culture with the culture represented in the other case studies. *Critical procedures* seek precise understanding of subtle associations, implications and problem areas. They seek both positive appreciation and negative sensitizing to potential exploitation and unconscious excess. . . . A final procedure in these studies points beyond understanding only and suggests appropriate and constructive responses. [p. 38]

The six case studies follow. While Real uses a wide range of approaches, cites an extensive literature, and has chosen varied topics, the results are limited and repetitive. Each chapter hammers home the theme that mass-mediated culture "primarily serves the interests of the relatively small political-economic power elite that sits atop the social pyramid." Disneyland represents "utopian typifications" and instructs through "morality plays that structure personal values and ideology." The study of the Super Bowl approaches it as a mythic spectacle, emphasizing dominant American institutions and ideology. Televised medical programs are examined by use of the concepts "genre" and "formula." A major conclusion is that the programs support cultural notions of health, glorify and protect the interests of doctors, and fail to make available to the public useful information on health and illness. The following chapter on a presidential campaign concludes that the current political communication system represents an "authoritarian use of mass-mediated