

Media, Culture & Society

<http://mcs.sagepub.com>

'The own in the foreign': reliable surprise - an important function of the media?

Klaus Schoenbach

Media Culture Society 2007; 29; 344

DOI: 10.1177/0163443707074269

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://mcs.sagepub.com>

Published by:

 SAGE Publications

<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Media, Culture & Society* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://mcs.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://mcs.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations (this article cites 8 articles hosted on the SAGE Journals Online and HighWire Press platforms):

<http://mcs.sagepub.com#BIBL>

‘The own in the foreign’: reliable surprise – an important function of the media?

Klaus Schoenbach

ZEPPELIN UNIVERSITY, FRIEDRICHSHAFEN, GERMANY

UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM, THE NETHERLANDS

I

In 2007 we are able to put together our complete diet of information and entertainment individually. The internet, of course, is making this possible. It contains virtually every form of information and entertainment that anybody could spontaneously be interested in, at any time of day or night. Elements of information and entertainment can be selected and ordered by ourselves (see e.g. Shapiro, 1999). Schoenbach and Lauf (2004) called this type of media offer ‘research’ content, a content to be used as a quarry, where everyone can individually pick and combine whatever they please – that is, the so-called ‘consultative’ pattern of information traffic (Bordewijk and Kaam, 1982; McQuail, 2005: 145ff.). Research content is not only to be found on the internet, but also in more traditional forms of media, such as encyclopaedias, catalogues, in books of paintings or photographs, telephone guides and handbooks. But certainly the most extensive research channel, the ‘ultra handbook,’ is the internet.

In contrast, ‘display’ media content (Schoenbach and Lauf, 2004) consists of ‘holistic’ offers – pre-selected, rank ordered, structured, contextualized and commented upon by *other* people, not by myself (see also Bordewijk and Kaam’s, 1982, ‘allocation’ pattern of communication). This applies to television and radio programming, newspapers, magazines, literary fiction, CDs and movies. Typically, display content is produced professionally, by journalists for instance. A similar concept applies to display entertainment: genre and quality conventions – how a detective story should be structured, how a quiz show has to be put together, or how a concert should sound – are normally decided on by experts.

The content of all display media is considerably more limited than that of the internet. They offer much less material to select from. In addition, display content restricts audience autonomy, not only because the media messages are pre-produced by somebody else, but also because the offer is often not available simultaneously and in real time, but has to be waited for. In other words, display media content is a ‘push’ offer,

one that forces itself on us, that wants to be consumed as is – with the aggressive claim of a 'take it or leave it'.

Sure, the internet also contains content that is pre-packaged – online newspapers and web portals, for instance. Links suggest what to look at next. And there are technical algorithms to pre-sort information – the most frequently quoted statement, for instance, or the most often clicked on. But large areas of the internet function like a lexicon, as a huge archive of information, with no professional pre-structuring – ideal for purposes of work, studying and coping with everyday-life chores, such as shopping, banking and travel arrangements. But will using the internet also replace watching television, listening to radio and reading newspapers and magazines?

II

Both the wealth of information on the internet and the unprocessed, 'raw' nature of many of its offers are hailed by some observers as instruments of liberation. Users become their own journalists, finally (e.g. Hartley, 2002; Negroponce, 1995), and their own movie directors. Display media and their producers, with their *déformation professionnelle*, are losing power. Internet consumers do not have to rely on a handful sources about public affairs any more. Internet users can easily consult dozens of sources online and thus should get a much more complete and unbiased picture of what is going on in the world.

But there is also scepticism about the blessings of the internet: Sunstein (2001) in his book *Republic.com* expresses deep fears about the future of democracy. He does not believe in a substantial audience that checks dozens of newspapers online everyday in order to get a complete picture of what is going on in society. The decreasing power of TV stations, newspapers and magazines is actually a catastrophe (p. 11). Those 'general interest intermediaries' are absolutely imperative for Sunstein. They generate a common core of community awareness without which democracy cannot endure.

This is why Sunstein is afraid of the anarchic freedom of the internet because it could lead to a dangerous fragmentation of the citizenry, even polarization – between those interested in public affairs and those who are not. Prior (2005) shows that the politically interested actually *profit* from the abundance of political information on the internet. But the majority, not particularly involved in politics, can now easily avoid being confronted by it at all (see also Mindich, 2005; Tewksbury, 2003).

Consequently, to prevent people from totally retreating to their own individual 'echo chambers', Sunstein (2001: 169ff.) even demands 'must-carry' rules, in the form of links, imposed on websites (but by whom?), designed to produce exposure to substantive questions of a society and to opposing views. And Prior (2005) pins his hopes on political advertising, because it can still hardly be avoided, even by those who find it utterly boring.

And, indeed, there are signs that people relying on the internet for topical information simply know fewer facts about public affairs than users of other media (Prior, 2005; Tewksbury and Althaus, 2000). Instead, and quite plausibly, internet users (and among them particularly the experienced ones) specialize more: they develop more densely interconnected knowledge structures, but only in the highly specific areas they are interested in (Eveland and Dunwoody, 2002; Eveland et al., 2002).

A representative panel study of the Dutch electorate shows that the more citizens inform themselves from the internet, the narrower the range of topics of current affairs in the Netherlands they are aware of, compared to the range of newspaper readers. This is true even after the different socio-demographic composition of the two groups is taken into account (Schoenbach et al., 2005; see also Marr, 2005).

Only the best-educated group of the Dutch survey, people with a university degree, seems to profit from the internet as an extensive and pluralistic source of societal information (Schoenbach et al., 2005; see also Prior, 2005). In contrast, those who are not particularly interested in public affairs are not reached by the internet's diversity. If these people read a newspaper, however, it conveys to them a wider range of topics (Schoenbach et al., 2005). In other words, people who normally ignore information about politics and the economy if they can, are 'trapped' by the display nature of the newspaper (about the 'trap' effect of display media see Schoenbach and Lauf, 2002a, 2004).

In an experiment, Southwell and Lee (2004) found that difference in knowledge between the users of display and research content may not only be due to the fact that the latter can more easily block out what they are not interested in. Even though Southwell and Lee had made all the subjects of their study expose themselves to the same elements of information on the internet, there was a difference in recall of the information. If the information was presented as a continuous film ('display'), it was remembered better than if it was split into parts that respondents had to click on, while being free to choose the order, to go at their own pace and even repeat any element ('research'). Maybe, then, it is understandable that Emmer (2005), in a strict causal analysis based on an extensive panel study, does not find that the use of the internet, as was hoped, *mobilizes* its users politically (see also Shaw et al., 2002; Wellman et al., 2001). It only helps them *encounter* more political content.

III

Up to now, however, fears of a public completely unaware of the outside world and busy only with their own personal hobbies seem exaggerated. The masses have not yet freed themselves from the patronage of journalists, novelists, scriptwriters and talk-show hosts. The traditional 'mediatization' of information and entertainment (Schulz, 2004) has not come to an end. Most of us still enjoy the 'lean-back' offers of the traditional media, as opposed to the 'lean-forward' ones on the internet. Most of us still wait for the news on television; watch movies the way they are offered; listen to pieces of music in the order suggested by a CD; allow ourselves to be enslaved by consecutive, 'linear' texts, from newspaper articles to books (Schmitt-Walter, 2004; SevenOne Media, 2005; Stipp, 2004; Waal et al., 2005). And even the internet itself does not seem to be used solely as a means to enjoy only one's own hobbies (Neuman, 2001).

This is why Hollywood director Christopher Nolan (*Batman Begins*) (quoted in *Der Spiegel* 24 June 2005: 130) is probably not right when he hopes that the DVD finally frees the cinema audience from being forced to watch movies from beginning to end. Nolan admires the DVD player for making it possible to jump back and forth in the chronology of a movie, to speed it up, slow it down or make it stand still at any point. He adds that now the viewer has control over the movie, and can put it under a magnifying glass or restructure it completely. Yes, DVD viewers are able to do that, but do they want to?

What could be the reason for people to allow display media to confront them, to pre-digest for them, to care for them, instead of grabbing everything actively from the internet whenever they please?

A first explanation for this strangely conservative attitude of the audience surely is that professional display media, such as newspapers, magazines, television and radio, still have practical advantages over the internet. Their professionalism offers something comfortable and reassuring: selecting and contextualizing information and entertainment is put into the hands of experts whom we (more or less) trust, and thus

saves us valuable time. Tasks that the audience does not deem worth its own effort are 'sourced out' (see e.g. Schoenbach, 1997, 2005b). People do not always want to be in control: 'They choose not to choose' (Tewksbury, 2006).

Another reason for the survival of traditional media could be that they help us act properly as social beings – which we probably still are, even after the internet has allowed us to encapsulate our information behaviour completely. Unrequested, display media inform us about what *the* others or what, at least, *others* find important, what one should be concerned about in one's community or country, or in the world. We would not get to know that if we only sought out those bits of information that are personally interesting to us. Display media offer topics to talk about with others. They make their audience aware of the newest fashion and opinion trends, for instance, and of what is socially acceptable (see e.g. Noelle-Neumann's 'spiral of silence', 1984).

They also enable us to laugh about the same subject because they provide what German writer Burkhard Spinnen (personal communication) calls the 'allusion potential' of a society. This potential makes joking about a prominent person or a specific event possible because we can assume that everybody knows, or at least most of the people know, whom or what we mean. Every stand-up comedian lives off this allusion potential.

Display media also convey feelings of belonging. They create identity – even if it is just the identity of those 'communities of arousal' that German philosopher Peter Sloterdijk (1999) describes, i.e. communities held together only by the fact that their 'members' jointly get excited about a particular topic or event. But simply knowing that the programme, the book, the newspaper, magazine, CD or DVD is also viewed, read or listened to by (sometimes many) others is important for us (Hartmann and Dohle, 2005). This is probably why, in Germany at least, the aficionados of polka music do not simply play a polka CD in the privacy of their homes. Instead, they insist that polka music be broadcast on prime-time public television. Because once officials decide to supply a (possibly large) audience with the same content simultaneously, they socially legitimize polka music – the 'status-conferral function' of display media (Lazarsfeld and Merton, as early as in 1948). They shift that type of music from the status of a strange hobby to a mass phenomenon, something one can proudly participate in.

IV

I think, however, that an important reason for why display media have not become obsolete is still missing. Maybe it is even the most important one: it is the enjoyment of *reliable surprises* (see also Schoenbach, 2005a). Surprise can be fun – the joy of new and unexpected information. For Desmond Morris (2004), but also for Johan Huizinga as early as in 1938, it belongs to the typical playfulness that characterizes not only children but also *adult* humans, as opposed to adult animals. This is why we actually even seek out surprises, and maintain a childlike pleasure about them.

There are problems to be solved, however: not all surprises are pleasant; unfortunately, many of them are bad ones. That does not keep us from looking for surprises. But we definitely want them tamed. Their taming is supposed to block off or at least soften *bad* surprises. But it also prevents us from being overwhelmed by sheer implausibility or extreme complexity, when surprise simply means the totally unexpected, anarchy and chaos. So, in other words, surprises should be (at least somewhat) *reliable*.

Abraham Moles, in his 1968 classic about the relationship between aesthetics and information theory, wrote that any aesthetic experience actually needs complexity, i.e. new and unexpected elements, but not too many. In other words, we find paintings, poems and literary fiction attractive if they are not too redundant but surprise us also

with new information. Once the surprise goes too far, however, we turn away in puzzlement or even anger. This is obviously a basic principle of enjoyment: we enjoy optimal challenges to our capabilities, cognitive or physical. We find challenges enjoyable that take an effort, but can still be handled well by us (see Vorderer et al., 2004; for an overview see Hartmann, 2005): reliable surprises?

Johan Galtung and Mari Holmboe Ruge discussed the delicate balance of surprise and reliability in their classic article 'The Structure of Foreign News' as early as in 1965. Their article is the big bang of news-value research. It describes selecting news in the media as a highly standardized process of assessing only a few characteristics of events to decide whether they are newsworthy. Galtung and Ruge (1965) postulate that, on the one hand, *unexpected* events have a higher news value for journalists (and obviously also for their audience). On the other hand, news value is also increased by *continuity*, by events following an expected course of action, i.e. by something reliable, not really surprising. The solution to this paradox lies, for the two authors, in a surprise that is embedded in the familiar – nothing less than a reliable surprise.

Reliable surprise also appears in Robert K. Merton's 'serendipity', the fortunate accident of any discovery, for example a scientific one. Merton says that such an accident has to be supported by 'institutionalized serendipity', by a 'serendipity pattern'. This pattern is a frame that makes a fruitful surprise possible – a limited chaos, in other words (see e.g. Merton and Barber, 2004).

We find a related principle in philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel's concept of 'the own in the foreign'. Hegel (e.g. 1970: 430ff.) uses it to explain why we are fascinated by antiquity and by exotic cultures. It is because there we discover, says Hegel, 'our own in the foreign'. On the one hand, we find features of ourselves, of our present time, in antique culture. Thus far, we are not surprised that much. But, on the other hand, we are also disturbed by the strange, the unheard-of, of that era. The combination of both, of the own and the foreign, causes the attraction of those cultures.

V

Whoever can offer us domesticated surprises is highly respected. We actually look for that combination in all areas of human life. A few examples: games that are supposed to be fun, from Scrabble to computer games, are characterized by a combination of random events or unpredictable moves of the partner, on the one hand, and undisputable rules, on the other.

Most people still go shopping to a grocery store, although they could get their shopping list delivered to their doorstep, often even at no extra cost. What is missing there, I postulate, is the pleasant surprise effect of the grocery store. It surprises us with brands or products we did not think of at home. This may lead to a change of plan as to what to shop for. At the same time, the surprise potential of the grocery store is limited and structured enough to not overwhelm us with chaos. So, enabling refrigerators by 'pervasive computing' to order missing items at the grocery store without even telling their owners, is probably tolerable only as long as the refrigerator limits its shopping to basics, such as milk and toast ...

Club vacations in far-away, maybe even dangerous, countries offer reliable surprises. Yes, it is exotic there. But not so exotic that one can't understand a word or might be served fried crickets for dinner. Roller-coasters and other fairground attractions allow us the excitement of surprises without their danger (hopefully). The same applies to the zoo compared to encounters with wildlife in the outdoors.

An experiment at an Amsterdam restaurant failed quickly: 'Sloom' did not offer a menu. Instead guests learned at their table what raw materials were available. The diners

were then supposed to make a selection and to determine what should happen to those materials: boiled, roasted, with what kinds of herbs, etc. After six months the restaurant closed.

VI

Reliable surprises are a valuable service that makes display media indispensable for most of us: they funnel and structure surprises; they prevent those surprises from being completely accidental and chaotic; and they take care that surprises are not too disturbing or even unbearable. Maybe the familiar surprise, 'routinising the unexpected' (Tuchman, 1978), is even the core function of traditional media, of the professional processing of information and entertainment.

Some evidence for the attraction of reliable surprises, offered by display media – in 10 years of international research on the factors involved in the success of newspapers (Schoenbach, 2004, 2005c; Schoenbach and Lauf, 2002b), one recipe has come up over and over again: to attract readers, regional subscription papers must be as diverse as possible in the topics they offer, on a day-by-day basis. Compact (tabloid) formats are too small for that purpose. They do not offer enough surprise at one glance. But this diversity has to be offered in a highly structured fashion. Successful newspapers use tables of contents, colours to guide readers through the paper and a reliable architecture for every section, even every page. Cues such as size, placement and the visual appeal of articles must suggest a rank order of relevance. Finally, analyses, context and comments prove to be essential to the newspaper audience. Combined, these are all measures to reduce the disturbing nature of surprises that the exciting thematic diversity of a newspaper inevitably contains. And, most important, information and entertainment must not be mixed in newspapers that want to be successful. Where people expect information, information has to be delivered. In other words, a reliable surprise.

We also still listen to music on the radio, instead of only using our own CDs or downloads from the internet. The reason is, I think, that listeners want to be at least somewhat surprised by rarely heard or even unknown music on their radio. But the formatting of radio stations prevents the fan of heavy metal being exposed to a Mozart sonata; that is, a familiar form of surprise is maintained. One may deplore this (wouldn't it be great to confront heavy-metal fans with Mozart?), but it does not alter the fact that most people do not want that much of surprise. Disc jockeys fit into this pattern as well: their reputation is high if the selection and order of their music surprises in a way that does not frighten their audiences by presenting them with too much of the unusual.

As early as two or three months after their purchase, Personal Video Recorders such as TiVo are hardly used any more for an individualized television diet or even for skipping commercials (Radvilas, 2005). Very soon TiVo serves as a comfortable, but very traditional VCR, as a replay device for display content from television.

VII

Reliable surprise: an important function of media? Will it guarantee the survival of display channels of information and entertainment in the midst of an abundance of research offers, simultaneously accessible? Research offers as a 'system of on-demand' entertainment and news, next to display ones as 'systems of no-demand' (Tewksbury, 2006)?

Success, or at least survival, of a display medium certainly depends on how attractive its balance of surprise and familiarity is. As the internet also contains display elements, display offers also differ in terms of their serendipity. Live reporting of electronic media, for instance, increases the chance of *unreliable* surprises, as opposed to channels that (have to) take their time processing the world outside and reflecting on it, such as newspapers and magazines. Even *within* a medium or channel we can discern differential surprise potentials: the *New York Times* may offer a wider range of possible surprises than *USA Today*; BBC 1 programming contains more diversity than a TV weather channel; a programme such as *Saturday Night Live* more than a football match.

It should benefit display channels to emphasize their display nature. Display channels that want to provide those familiar surprises to their audience should not imitate the internet. The internet simply serves other purposes and does that well. The two deadly sins for traditional media in that respect are: simply extending the information available without contextualizing it, or reducing diversity and thus the surprise potential. On the one hand, news sites that serve only as an archive of unconnected news items could increasingly have problems. On the other hand, newspapers that look like daily specialized magazines, instead of offering a wide range of topical information, are an endangered species.

Also, a so-called responsive, interactive, dialogical, collaborative, journalistic culture (Deuze, 2003: 219), one that urges the audience to participate in the production of media content, would be counterproductive for display media. The disadvantages of such a well-intended strategy to increase the audience for that content are twofold: on the one hand, 'citizen journalism' decreases the surprise value because I read myself, watch myself and listen to myself. On the other hand, and more importantly, there may not be enough professionalism protecting me from the potential chaos that others may produce. This is why display content has to insist on professionalism, on expertise. Of course, that professionalism can also be offered in display content on the internet. Because the 'franchise' of display media is not a specific form – printed newspapers, magazines or television for instance – it is journalism.

Naturally, the audience has a say in deciding what it accepts as a ready-made display offer and what it wants to explore in the research mode. Of course, even the most universal newspaper can be used as a sort of yellow pages – by simply ignoring everything but the movie-theatre section. And, certainly, one can graze infinitely between strongly display TV programmes and thus piece together one's very own TV broadcast. And, self-evidently, all one may use on the internet is the online version of the *New York Times*, which one reads completely, article by article, exactly the way it is posted there. So, instead of research and display *offers* we could plausibly speak of research and display *use* of media content. This does not alter the fact, however, that media content profiles itself as research or display, and subsequently is also used that way by the vast majority of the audience.

Within the audience itself, there certainly are different concepts of where the border runs between a reliable and an unreliable surprise. Where one individual may be overwhelmed by the slightest deviation from the daily news routine and call it chaos, another one may be pleasantly surprised by the same aberrance. 'Sensation seekers' (Zuckerman, 1979), for instance, or people with a strong 'need for cognition' (Cacioppo and Petty, 1982) certainly find a higher proportion of surprise enjoyable. And the restaurant that failed in Amsterdam because it required too many decisions from its clients could probably thrive in Italy's countryside. And, finally, among all those familiar surprises we certainly sometimes wait for the real surprises, the unreliable ones.

Note

The author wishes to thank Professor Lori A. Bergen, Texas State University, for her valuable and inspiring comments.

References

- Bordewijk, J.L. and B. van Kaam (1982). *Allocutie: Enkele gedachten over communicatievrijheid in een bekabeld land*. Baarn, The Netherlands: Bosch and Keuning.
- Cacioppo, J.T. and R.E. Petty (19982). 'The Need for Cognition', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 42: 116–31.
- Deuze, M. (2003) 'The Web and Its Journalisms: Considering the Consequences of Different Types of News Media Online', *New Media & Society* 5: 203–30.
- Emmer, M. (2005) *Politische Mobilisierung durch das Internet? Eine kommunikationswissenschaftliche Untersuchung zur Wirkung eines neuen Mediums*. Munich: Reinhard Fischer.
- Eveland Jr, W.P. and S. Dunwoody (2002) 'An Investigation of Elaboration and Selective Scanning as Mediators of Learning from the Web versus Print', *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 46: 34–53.
- Eveland, W. P., Jr., Seo, M., and Marton, K. (2002) 'Learning from the News in Campaign 2000: An Experimental Comparison of TV News, Newspapers and Online News', *Media Psychology* 4: 353–78.
- Galtung, J. and M.H. Ruge (1965) 'The Structure of Foreign News: The Presentation of the Congo, Cuba and Cyprus Crises in Four Foreign Newspapers', *Journal of International Peace Research* 1: 64–90.
- Hartley, J. (2002) *Communication, Cultural and Media Studies: The Key Concepts*, 3rd edn. London: Routledge.
- Hartmann, T. (2005) 'Die Selektion unterhaltsamer Medienangebote am Beispiel von Computerspielen: Struktur und Ursachen', unpublished dissertation, Hannover University of Music and Drama.
- Hartmann, T. and M. Dohle (2005) 'Publikumsvorstellungen im Rezeptionsprozess', *Publizistik* 50: 287–303.
- Hegel, G.W. (1970) *Werke in zwanzig Bänden. Bd. 13: Vorlesungen über die Ästhetik I*. Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp.
- Huizinga, J. (1938) *Homo ludens: Proeve eener bepaling van het spel-element der cultuur*. Haarlem: Tjeenk Willink.
- Lazarsfeld, P.F. and R.K. Merton (1948) 'Mass Communication, Popular Taste and Organized Social Action', pp. 95–118 in L. Bryson (ed.) *The Communication of Ideas*. New York: Harper.
- Marr, M. (2005) *Internetzugang und politische Informiertheit: Zur digitalen Spaltung der Gesellschaft*. Constance, Germany: UVK.
- McQuail, D. (2005) *McQuail's Mass Communication Theory*, 5th edn. London: Sage.
- Merton, R.K. and E.G. Barber (2004) *The Travels and Adventures of Serendipity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Mindich, D.T.Z. (2005) *Tuned Out: Why Americans under 40 Don't Follow the News*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Moles, A.A. (1968) *Information Theory and Esthetic Perception*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Morris, D. (2004) *The Naked Woman: A Study of the Female Body*. New York: Thomas Dunne Books.

- Negroponte, N. (1995) *Being Digital*. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Neuman, W.R. (2001) 'The Impact of the New Media', pp. 299–320 in W.L. Bennett and R.M. Entman (eds) *Mediated Politics: Communication in the Future of Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Noelle-Neumann, E. (1984) *The Spiral of Silence*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Prior, M. (2005) 'News vs. Entertainment: How Increasing Media Choice Widens Gaps in Political Knowledge', *American Journal of Political Science* 49: 577–92.
- Radvilas, H. (2005) 'Vermarkter glauben an TV *Horizont* 23(9 June): 33.
- Schmitt-Walter, N. (2004) *Online-Medien als funktionale Alternative? Über die Konkurrenz zwischen den Mediengattungen*. Munich: Reinhard Fischer.
- Schoenbach, K. (1997) 'Das hyperaktive Publikum – Essay über eine Illusion', *Publizistik* 42: 279–86.
- Schoenbach, K. (2004) 'A Balance between Imitation and Contrast: What Makes Newspapers Successful? A Summary of Internationally Comparative Research', *Journal of Media Economics* 17: 219–27.
- Schoenbach, K. (2005a) '"Das Eigene im Fremden": Zuverlässige Ueberraschung – eine wesentliche Medienfunktion?', *Publizistik* 50: 344–52.
- Schoenbach, K. (2005b) 'The Hyperactive Audience – Still an Illusion: An essay, "Revisited"', pp. 267–77 in P. Roessler and F. Krotz (eds) *Mythen der Mediengesellschaft – The Media Society and its Myths* Constance, Germany: UVK.
- Schoenbach, K. (2005c) 'Comparative Readership Studies: Constructive Cultural Criticism', pp. 207–14 in S. Dunwoody, L.B. Becker, D.M. McLeod and G.M. Kosicki (eds) *The Evolution of Key Mass Communication Concepts: Honoring Jack M. McLeod*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- Schoenbach, K. and E. Lauf (2002a) 'The "Trap" Effect of Television and its Competitors', *Communication Research* 29: 564–83.
- Schoenbach, K. and E. Lauf (2002b) 'Content or Design? Factors Influencing the Circulation of US and German Newspapers', *Communications* 27: 1–14.
- Schoenbach, K. and E. Lauf (2004) 'Another Look at the "Trap" Effect of Television – and Beyond', *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 16: 169–82.
- Schoenbach, K., E. de Waal and E. Lauf (2005) 'Online and Print Newspapers: Their Impact on the Extent of the Perceived Public Agenda', *European Journal of Communication* 20: 245–58.
- Schulz, W. (2004) 'Reconstructing Mediatisation as an Analytical Concept', *European Journal of Communication* 19: 87–101.
- SevenOne Media (2005) 'Täglich eine Stunde Web: Langzeitstudie "TimeBudget"', *Research & Results* 3: 58–9.
- Shapiro, A.L. (1999) *The Control Revolution: How the Internet is Putting Individuals in Charge and Changing the World We Know*. New York: PublicAffairs.
- Shaw, D., M. Schmierbach, J. Hawkins, R. Espino and J. Donovan (2002) 'Nonrecursive Models of Internet Use and Community Engagement: Questioning whether Time Spent Online Erodes Social Capital', *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 79: 964–87.
- Sloterdijk, P. (1999) *Regeln für den Menschenpark*. Frankfurt aM: Suhrkamp.
- Southwell, B.G. and M. Lee (2004) 'A Pitfall of New Media? User Controls Exacerbate Editing Effects on Memory', *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 81: 643–56.
- Stipp, H. (2004) 'Der Zuschauer und das Beduerfnis nach Interaktivitaet: Ein Blick in die USA', pp. 121–7 in C. zu Salm (ed.) *Zaubermaschine interaktives Fernsehen? TV-Zukunft zwischen Bluetentraeumen und Businessmodellen*. Wiesbaden: Gabler.
- Sunstein, C.R. (2001) *Republic.com*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Tewksbury, D. (2003) 'What Do Americans Really Want to Know? Tracking the Behavior of News Readers on the Internet', *Journal of Communication* 53: 694–710.
- Tewksbury, D. (2006) 'The Future Holds Less and More for the American News Audience', *Political Communication Report* 16.
- Tewksbury, D. and S. Althaus (2000) 'Differences in Knowledge Acquisition among Readers of the Paper and Online Versions of a National Newspaper', *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 77: 457–79.
- Tuchman, G. (1978) *Making News*. New York: Free Press.
- Vorderer, P., C. Klimmt and U. Ritterfeld (2004) 'Enjoyment: At the Heart of Media Entertainment', *Communication Theory* 14: 388–408.
- Waal, E. de, K. Schoenbach and E. Lauf (2005) 'Online Newspapers: A Substitute or Complement for Print Newspapers and Other Information Channels?', *Communications* 30: 55–72.
- Wellman, B., A.Q. Haase, J. Witte and K. Hampton (2001) 'Does the Internet Increase, Decrease or Supplement Social Capital?', *American Behavioral Scientist* 45: 436–55.
- Zuckerman, M. (1979) *Sensation Seeking: Beyond the Optimal Level of Arousal*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Klaus Schoenbach is Professor, Chair of Media Science, Zeppelin University, Friedrichshafen, Germany, and Chair of General Communication Science, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands. *Address*: University of Amsterdam, Kloveniersburgwal 48, NL-1012 CX, Amsterdam. [email: k.schoenbach@uva.nl]