INTRODUCTION, OR HOW TO COOK AN ARTICHOKE

Mary Celeste Kearney

Imagine that you're on a hillside somewhere near the Mediterranean Sea sometime in the distant past, before human beings invented agriculture. You're with a small group of people who are looking for edible vegetation for yourselves and your families. You're hungry, but the land is dry and doesn't offer up much by way of food. So you have to make do with what you can find. Eventually you see a plant in the distance that's about waist-high with large, arching, frond-like leaves, and ask each other: *What is this? Is it edible?* Upon closer inspection, you realize that the plant has several green, flower-like bulbs a bit larger than a fist. You bend near one, notice its faint, fragrant smell, and attempt to bite into it. But you can't get past the tough petals. Rather than turn away empty-handed, your hunger prompts another question: *How might we cook it?*

In reality, developing effective methods for cooking an artichoke must have taken considerable trial and error, for the plant's most edible and flavorful parts—the heart and choke—are buried deep within its blossoms, protected by numerous tough, scale-like petals, each of which is adorned with a sharp thorn. Indeed, even after careful cultivation over hundreds of years, the artichoke remains a formidable plant for those who farm it. Yet, over that same period of time, different cooks have developed strategies for transforming artichokes into delicious food. Each of the primary methods—roasting, boiling, frying, steaming—produces different results, revealing the many different cooked artichokes that can be created from using just the raw blossoms of this strange plant.

The craft of academic criticism—the subject of this book—entails a process similar to the one the first artichoke gatherers likely undertook: Scholars search for interesting objects or people or concepts about which we have questions, and we must determine the best strategy of analysis, or **methodology**, that will help us to answer those questions and produce significant results.

The Craft of Criticism introduces readers to the diverse set of methodologies used in **critical media studies**, a broadly international and interdisciplinary field that encompasses research related to film, television, radio, games, popular music, and the Internet. Critical media scholars understand **media culture** as encompassing not just the world of media texts (e.g., songs, websites, television programs), but also the realms of media production and media consumption. More specifically, the field of critical media studies includes scholarship on the content, style, and meanings of media texts; the artistic and business practices of producers and industries that create those texts; and audience members' interactions with such texts in their everyday lives.

Many critical media scholars focus their attention on mainstream/commercial media culture, which is the most dominant globally. However, a significant number investigate independent/non-commercial forms of media instead. This alternate arena has been especially important to scholars interested in marginalized groups long overlooked by the media industries, such as women, people of color, the disabled, the working class, and members of the LGBTQI community. While numerous media scholars focus on current media culture, others engage in historical analyses by exploring older media texts as well as older systems of media production and reception. Yet even researchers who focus on today's media are historians, in the sense that such work requires critical reflection on the contemporary sociopolitical moment to understand the full meaning of the objects, people, or concepts being studied.

A primary goal of this collection is to provide readers with a plentiful toolkit of methods that can be used when developing your own studies and interpretations of media culture. As such, this volume is organized primarily by method rather than by medium to emphasize the adaptability of these research strategies to different sites in our expansive mediascapes. Each chapter addresses a particular method and is written by an established scholar who both teaches in that area and conducts research using that approach. Each contributor demonstrates the application of that method via their discussion of a case study from their own scholarship. The methods outlined in this volume draw from critical traditions related to aesthetics, literature, technology, philosophy, economics, sociology, linguistics, psychology, history, anthropology, and geography. The study of film and television are at the heart of many of the discussions included here, but this collection also covers methods used by scholars who research sound, games, popular music, and other forms of media. In turn, this book includes several chapters that explore the particular challenges faced by researchers of emergent technologies, such as digital media.

Each method outlined in this volume has its own intellectual history and thus conceptualizes media culture's various objects, players, practices, and institutions in a distinct way. Yet the broader field of media studies is grounded upon interlocking and overlapping critical literacies built up over time. Thus, many of the methods covered here have intellectual histories that converge with the development of other approaches to analyzing media culture. Meanwhile, several chapters included in this collection focus on complex research topics, such as media history, that are best served by a multi-method approach.

By including twenty-seven research methods in this collection, we hope to disabuse readers of the notion that there is only one way, or a small number of ways, to study media culture. Instead, we want to expose you to the breadth of methodologies in our field and to encourage you to think creatively and expansively about the strategies that might work best in your own media research. Moreover, we hope that this volume works as a companion that helps you to make sense of methods employed in other scholarship you are reading.

What Is Research? Where Do I Begin?

Research is the common umbrella term for those activities focused on gathering information to advance knowledge. Research involves the systematic study of some object, person, institution, practice, or concept, and often entails developing solutions to problems. At its most basic, research involves asking a question, gathering data or evidence, analyzing that information, and answering the question. Yet most research projects involve many other steps on the path to knowledge discovery, insightful explanations, and innovative applications. Moreover, there are many forms of research, spanning from those that are experimental and performed in laboratories to those that are analytical and require little more than the researcher and a singular object. Most critical media scholarship falls into this second category.

All research begins with an **object of study**, the thing being analyzed. In critical media studies, objects of study are often (but not always) individual units of a particular medium, such as a film, website, or television series. Critical media scholars commonly refer to such objects as **texts,** a term borrowed from literary studies. When analyzing media texts, a key issue for us is understanding the tensions that exist between **medium specificity** and **media convergence**. That is, we must balance the idea that each medium has its own particular formal properties, conditions of production, institutional structures, and associated cultural practices (e.g., film as different from radio) with an awareness that an increasing number of media properties are produced for consumption across a variety of media platforms (e.g., comics, games, and television). Media convergence is largely due to contemporary culture's dominance by **media conglomerates**, which own multiple companies involved in the production of virtually all forms of popular entertainment and communication, including film, broadcasting, music, games, publishing, and the Internet.[1]

The range of objects studied by critical media scholars is much broader than the various media texts produced by the culture industries, however. As demonstrated by the case studies discussed in this collection, that range spans from the material to the abstract, from, say, subway ads for new television series to governmental regulations related to the electromagnetic spectrum. Moreover, the range of objects analyzed by critical media scholars is expansive both temporally and spatially, encompassing texts, institutions, practices, and practitioners associated with media cultures past and present as well as local and global.

While many reasons exist for why a critical media scholar might focus on specific research topic, that

decision is often determined, at least in part, by which objects are readily accessible. After all, most students and many professors are unable to conduct research out of town at either archives or media companies due to cost and accessibility. Fortunately, the Internet has made many media texts available to us in our own homes. But the Internet is not a complete archive of every media text ever made as it is limited by human interest as well as time and money. Many other worthy objects of study are available to media scholars, however, in local libraries, archives, museums, and bookstores, without requiring too much time or expense to access. We encourage you to be creative when surveying the field of potential objects of study and to consider focusing on those that have received little scholarly attention thus far in order to expand the larger pool of knowledge about media culture.

Good research, like all good writing, begins with curiosity, and for many media scholars, our curiosity about certain aspects of media culture is related to our identities, experiences, tastes, and literacies. Your initial interest in an object or topic will likely be multiplied many times over as you conduct more research on it, and that interest will sustain you through what might be a long, challenging period of study. The point is not to select an object because it is deemed worthy or appropriate by other people. Indeed, the field of critical media studies has largely been developed by scholars who have resisted dominant academic tastes and risked their professional reputations by studying such "lowly" media texts as soap operas, horror films, video games, pop hits, and reality TV shows, not to mention the producers and fans of such media. Fortunately, you have a wide swath of objects to choose from, particularly if you remember that it's not just media texts that critical media scholars study, but also the practices and practitioners of media production and reception.

One of the challenges of conducting media research is that media are ubiquitous in contemporary society, so much so that many of us cannot conceive of life without them. We regularly consume media throughout the day from technologies that are readily at our fingertips, whether that's playing games on our tablets, participating in social media on our smart phones, listening to songs on our car radios, or watching movies on our TV sets. Because media culture is so much a part of our daily lives, and because we often spend a great deal of time talking about it with others, its various objects, practices, and players (if not institutions) often seem very familiar to us. Yet that familiarity can blind us to how those various aspects of media culture might appear to others, as well as to how our own values, literacies, and preconceptions have made our own media tastes and practices seem natural and universal. Therefore, the critical analysis of media culture requires us to challenge our initial assumptions about it and to view its different components with fresh eyes so that we can be open to understanding them in new ways.

Every object of study is an artichoke—a thorny, difficult challenge that requires particular tools to make manageable. The most essential tools you can use in this process are the questions you have about your object. Once you have determined your object of study, you must consider what **research questions** arise from it, or in relation to it, and decide which you're most interested in pursuing further. Many research questions can be related to one object of study, and scholars often brainstorm to determine what all of the potential questions might be before moving forward with their study. Nevertheless, the questions that emerge from a singular object of study are not infinite but instead limited by the place and time, or **sociohistorical context**, in which it appears. For example, to return to our story of the artichoke, the food gathers' interest in that plant and the questions posed by them about it were constrained by their particular geographic and historic location, that is, the Mediterranean during pre-agricultural times. If a similar group of hungry people encountered an artichoke plant in 2018 Chicago, they would likely ignore it altogether and go to a grocery store to obtain food. Indeed, the presence of artichoke plants in urban environments today is more often for aesthetic than gastronomic purposes.

Primary sources can elicit questions about the object of study also. A **primary source** is a document that is closely related to the object being analyzed and was produced at approximately the same time that it was created. Primary sources are the raw materials out of which you build an initial portrait of your object of study. For example, in a study of the audience of a particular television series, letters from audience members to the production company would function as primary sources. In a study about a media celebrity, an autobiography or diary would be considered a primary source. Primary sources are especially important when an object of study has received little scholarly attention and when a researcher wants to question or refute the official or common-sense story about the object under analysis.

Another important frame to consider with regard to narrowing research questions is the scope of your

interests in your object. For example, in our artichoke story, the people who encountered the plant had basic needs that impacted their interaction with it. In other words, their hunger led them to approach it in a certain way, and that framing limited the questions they had about it. They likely knew from previous experience that many plants with fruit are edible. So, when they happened upon the artichoke plant and saw its blossoms, they perceived it as potential food. Hence, they didn't ask, "Can we write with it?" or "How do we make shoes from it?" Instead, they asked, "Is it edible?" and hoped that it was. Similarly, the interests of scholars can provide additional contextual frames that limit and direct the questions we ask of our object of study. Indeed, your personal investment in an object can influence the pleasure you have interacting with it, which in turn can lead you to question, for example, why you and others enjoy it and why some people do not.

One way scholars consciously limit their research questions is by conducting a **literature review** of prior research or public commentary about their object of study or similar objects. Such research projects serve as the scholar's **secondary sources**, that is, work that helps to contextualize your own object of study. These sources can include non-academic materials, such as film reviews from the popular press, yet more typically involve academic scholarship. The bibliographies and endnotes of familiar academic books and articles can be rich sources for ideas about additional research materials; they can also help you to map the larger critical conversations in which those scholars are engaged. Researchers typically rely as well on electronic databases, such as Google Scholar, to find other scholarship related to their objects of study, as such databases can offer an expansive view of research on a particular topic. Once you have determined which studies are most similar to and important for your own, you make notes of common themes and arguments, which helps in determining your questions and narrowing the scope of your research to something innovative yet manageable. Given the breadth of information contained in databases today, not to mention the interdisciplinary nature of critical media studies, the biggest challenge for researchers is often not finding scholars who have explored their object of study, but determining the threads of debate that connect the particular types of research related to it.

After you have selected your object of study, conducted your literature review, and determined your research questions, you must select a strategy, or set of strategies, for analysis that will help you to produce answers to those questions. In research, we call these strategies **methodologies**, or "methods" for short. To clarify what a method is, let's return again to our artichoke story: Once our hungry food gatherers failed at eating the raw artichoke, they had to determine what type of cooking might work best to produce something edible. Given the pre-agricultural time period, the gatherers likely roasted the artichoke on a long stick over an open fire, which softened the leaves and exposed the tender heart and choke. After hundreds of years, humans have advanced significantly with cooking technology, and we now have several methods to choose from when determining how to prepare a raw artichoke for eating.

Bringing this all back home to critical media studies: Every movie that catches our eye, every pop song that expresses our feelings, every game that keeps us striving to reach the next level, every TV show that makes us wonder about just who else is watching . . . is an artichoke. We find an object; it captures our curiosity and inspires questions; we poke it and ask more questions; maybe it pokes back. Eventually, however, we have to figure out how to cook it.

Methods in Critical Media Studies

Scholars have a wide array of methodologies from which to choose when determining how to analyze their objects of study. The broader field of such methods is typically divided into two types: **quantitative** approaches, which are scientific in orientation and involve mathematical or computational techniques; and **qualitative** approaches, which involve interpretation supported by **critical theories**, that is, speculative explanations developed from research studies conducted by other scholars. While quantitative data can offer answers to such questions as "How much?" or "Of what kind?" and thus help scholars to paint a general picture of a media text, its production, or reception, qualitative media scholars pursue such questions as "How?" "Why?" and "What's at stake?"

The vast majority of critical media scholars gravitate toward this second category, qualitative analysis, as we seek to understand and offer informed interpretations of specific qualities or aspects of media culture. Yet we are also committed to broadening knowledge beyond those objects of study by offering theoretically informed insights on how they impact the larger realms of art, culture, commerce, politics, and society.[2] This is why we use the word "critical" in the title of our field. That tradition traces back to the early part of the twentieth century and such scholars

of media culture as Sergei Eisenstein, who developed theories of cinematic form, and Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno, who first analyzed the culture industries.[3] Nevertheless, many critical theories used by media scholars are not specific to media culture, the arts, or commerce; a vast array of critical theories has been developed in disciplines across the humanities, fine arts, and social sciences that are useful in the study of media culture. It is through our careful questioning and analysis of media culture using established critical theories that we produce strong, convincing arguments that encourage other people to see it anew and to understand its relation to larger society. One of the challenges for each critical media scholar is determining which theories best align with our project and can best support our argument.

Let's consider an example of critical media analysis: Perhaps you are interested in studying the first fictional television series to feature a Japanese girl as the protagonist. You might be interested in this show because no studies have been conducted to determine its specific artistic and commercial qualities and how they might relate to other media texts involving Japanese girlhood and girls in general. Thus, the research questions that might be used to direct this study include, "In what kind of story does the Japanese girl appear?" and "How is this character portrayed?" Such questions are related to the broad field of critical methods known as **textual analysis**, approaches that involve the close study of particular qualities of individual literary or artistic objects to determine their meaning. More specifically, the two research questions raised above in relation to the Japanese girl TV show are associated, respectively, with narrative and representational forms of textual analysis. As demonstrated in Chapters 3 and 8 of this collection, many scholars have formulated critical theories related to the practices of storytelling and representation. Therefore, as the researcher, you would need to review the literature not only on this TV show, Japanese broadcasting, and girls' television series, but also scholarship on narration and representation to determine which theories might work best for your particular analysis. (This series' narrative and representational strategies are not the only textual elements that you could study, however. As other chapters in this volume demonstrate, you could also analyze, for example, the discursive themes, sound style, or performance strategies associated with this particular TV show.)

Other qualitative approaches beyond textual analysis could also be used to interpret the first television series featuring a Japanese girl. For instance, if you were interested in how this particular TV show was created, you might ask questions related to the people who worked on the show and the practices involved in its production. Such questions might include, "How are the creator's identity and experiences related to those of the protagonist?" and "What type of actors were considered when casting the lead character?" This method is referred to as **production analysis**. Critical studies of media producers have long been a part of our field, as authorship has been a primary focus of film, television, and popular music studies, all of which have antecedents in older disciplines, like literature, theatre, and art, where artists have been important sites of inquiry. Nevertheless, authorship and artistry are just two of the topics scholars of media production can study. As Chapter 22 of this volume demonstrates, a growing number of scholars have been researching the media industries and their practices of creation, distribution, exhibition, and marketing, using theories from various disciplines, including economics and business. In turn, our field has seen an increase in policy analysis, the topic of Chapter 11, which focuses on the relationship between governmental regulations and media culture.

Another possible way of analyzing this Japanese girl television series relates to its audience. Questions that might inspire this type of study include, "How did girls in Japan engage with this series, either alone or in groups?" and "How did girls outside Japan react to this show?" A research project employing this methodological frame would be labeled a **reception study**. While many scholars have employed psychoanalytical theory to speculate on the processes of media reception (see Chapter 12), other media scholars, particularly those whose work is informed by cultural studies, sociology, and anthropology, have used ethnographic analyses to understand the practices and pleasures of media audiences (see Chapters 14 and 15).

Sociohistorical context is relevant in each of these potential studies, for context always impacts meaning. For example, with regard to conducting a textual analysis of the television series featuring the first Japanese girl protagonist, the place and time depicted in the show have specific implications for its meaning. Consider, for example, the difference between Japan in the 1910s versus Japan in the 1980s. In turn, the place and time of the show's production also contribute to its meaning—for example, consider a Japanese series made in the 1960s in comparison to an Australian series from the early 2000s. The place

and time of viewers' engagement with the show are important to consider as well. Indeed, the same person could interact with this TV series at two different points in their life, say the 1950s and the 1990s, and develop two different interpretations of it based on changes in their literacies, tastes, and identities.

Cultural Studies and the Integrated, Multiperspectival Approach

Attention to sociohistorical context is crucial for critical media scholars, and this is largely due to the significant impact on our field by **cultural studies**, an interdisciplinary approach to analyzing popular culture developed by British researchers in the second half of the twentieth century.[4] A key concern among cultural studies scholars is to develop methodological strategies in our research that produce richly contextualized and nuanced interpretations of our objects of study, or what anthropologist Clifford Geertz, in a different context, labeled "thick descriptions."[5] For media scholars trained in cultural studies, this means attending to the social, historical, political, and economic contexts of our objects of study in order to answer the hows, whys, and so whats of critical qualitative analysis. According to Lawrence Grossberg, cultural studies' argument for the significance of contextuality in cultural analysis is that "[n]o element can be isolated from its relations." Rather,

> the identity, significance, and effects of any practice or event . . . are defined only by the complex set of relations that surround, interpenetrate, and shape it, and make it what it is. . . . Any event can only be understood relationally, as a condensation of multiple determinations and effects.[6]

Ideally, all critical media research projects will touch upon all three sites of media culture—texts, production, and reception—while respecting the blurred boundaries between them and also attending to sociohistorical context. Yet doing so is quite difficult, especially if your time and resources are limited, as is particularly the case for many students and contingent faculty members. Julie D'Acci's pathbreaking book *Defining Women: Television and the Case of* Cagney & Lacey is one of the few projects to have attended successfully to the media culture of which this television text was part.[7] She offers critical insights not only about *Cagney & Lacey*, but also its producers and strategies of production, as well as its various interpretive communities, including fans, critics, and activists. D'Acci describes this methodological strategy as an **integrated approach** to understanding the **circuit of media study**.[8] Douglas Kellner describes a similar approach and refers to it as **multiperspectival**.[9] Most critical media scholars today find that attending to two sites in media culture (say, a text and its production, or a text and its audience) is adequate for any one study, as long as you also engage in sociohistorical contextualization and are conscious that the third, unstudied site of media culture might have relevance to your interpretations as well.

Cultural studies' turn toward popular culture helped to legitimate as worthy objects of study not only films and television, but also magazines, games, comics, popular music, the Internet, and many other forms of popular entertainment. Moreover, by taking seriously those elements of media culture that have long been considered inappropriate for academic attention, media scholars informed by cultural studies have foregrounded the mechanisms of **pleasure** at work in consuming media.

Such commitments to reclaim "low" forms of media culture and their audiences are connected to cultural studies' deep investment in the analysis of **power**, an intellectual legacy formed by such critical theorists as Karl Marx, Antonio Gramsci, and Michel Foucault.[10] Thus, political economy, ideology, and discourse—each the subject of an individual chapter in this collection—have been at the heart of many critical media studies projects. Media scholars informed by the cultural studies approach readily investigate the workings of power in media culture, attempting to bring greater understanding to systems of categorization, dominance, and oppression as well as to strategies of resistance, self-determination, and survival. This political project has been further emboldened through media scholars' influence by **poststructuralist theories**, which challenge us to think outside traditional frameworks of meaning and to understand reality as socially constructed through language, media, and other forms of signification.[11] In turn, critical media scholars' attention to power can be seen through our adoption and application of theories developed in feminist and queer studies, critical race studies, subculture studies, postcolonial studies, and disability studies. As new media forms emerge, critical media scholars build from this rich legacy to develop innovative theories about how power and pleasure work in media culture.

Ongoing Conversations

The chapters collected here are organized into three major parts. The first, Primary Methods, articulates those research methodologies that lie at the heart of critical media studies, including narrative, style, and discourse analysis. These approaches are among the oldest and most popularly used by critical media scholars today. The book's second part, Synthetic and Multiperspectival Methods, articulates the mixed methodologies that inform such areas of critical media inquiry as genre, history, production, and globalization. Finally, the Emergent and Challenging Objects part broadens the collection's scope to discuss the particular methodological challenges that arise when researching new and complicated media forms, such as games, software, and Internet-based cultures.

As each contributor to this book demonstrates, every research methodology associated with critical media studies has a long and complicated history, as new scholars rework old approaches, often formulated in other academic fields, to develop new strategies for exploring and understanding their objects of study. In addition to outlining the intellectual development of a particular method and a discussion of why and how it emerged, each chapter offers relevant examples of influential work in that area, as well as an in-depth review of a case study drawn from the author's own scholarship. Additionally, each chapter includes a discussion of the method's current and future applicability in a field that increasingly employs multi-method research to explore texts and cultural processes that cross the boundaries between traditional media forms. Each author has also included recommended readings if you would like to dig deeper into a particular method or topic.

An important reminder before you proceed further, however: Qualitative analyses produce speculations about objects of study, not truth. While scholars using qualitative methods amass evidence, just as quantitative scholars do, such evidence is not gathered and quantified in order to make statistical generalizations about a broad number of media texts, practices, players, or institutions. Instead, it is gathered and analyzed via the application of critical theories in order to offer informed interpretations that can be utilized by other scholars in their own studies. Thus, qualitative researchers are not interested in offering the one true, definitive meaning of their objects of study. Instead, we understand that each object is **polysemous** (i.e., has numerous potential meanings), and that each person who interacts with it brings their own knowledge, values, and identities to their comprehension of it. As a result, qualitative research is an ongoing enterprise involving numerous people, with scholars entering into critical conversations that began well before we were born and will continue long after we die. Literary scholar Kenneth Burke uses a productive analogy to describe this process:

> Imagine that you enter a parlor. You come late. When you arrive, others have long preceded you, and they are engaged in a heated discussion, a discussion too heated for them to pause and tell you exactly what it is about. In fact, the discussion had already begun long before any of them got there, so that no one present is qualified to retrace for you all the steps that had gone before. You listen for a while, until you decide that you have caught the tenor of the argument; then you put in your oar. Someone answers; you answer him; another comes to your defense; another aligns himself against you, to either the embarrassment or gratification of your opponent, depending upon the quality of your ally's assistance. However, the discussion is interminable. The hour grows late, you must depart. And you do depart, with the discussion still vigorously in progress.[12]

To engage meaningfully in qualitative research, it is important for scholars to first understand the basic rules and norms of the conversations in which we immerse ourselves, as well as their longer histories. That principle aligns well with the main objectives of this collection: to equip you with the knowledge not only of the methods you can use to interpret media culture, but also of the history and intellectual traditions of those approaches. We hope that this helps you to be a better reader of critical media scholarship, to make informed and creative choices as you proceed with your research, and to participate confidently in the conversations in our parlor. Put in your oar.

Notes

1. See Henry Jenkins, *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide* (New York: New York University Press, 2006).
2. Because of the strong connection of method and theory in qualitative media studies, it is sometimes difficult to determine which is which. For example,

psychoanalytic media criticism involves the application of theories developed within the field of psychoanalysis to media texts; the method and the theory are closely entwined. As a result, in some areas of critical media studies, scholars have not articulated and discussed methods as much as theories.

3. Sergei Eisenstein, *Film Form: Essays in Film Theory*, ed. and trans. Jay Leyda (1949; New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2014); Max Horkheimer and Theodor W. Adorno, *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, ed. Gunzelin Schmid Noerr, trans. Edmund Jeffcott (1944; Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002).
4. For a brief history of cultural studies, see Simon During, "Introduction," in *The Cultural Studies Reader*, 3rd edition, ed. Simon During (New York: Routledge, 2007), 1–30.
5. Clifford Geertz, "Thick Description: Toward an Interpretive Theory of Culture" in *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books, 1973), 3–30.
6. Lawrence Grossberg, *Cultural Studies in the Future Tense* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2010), 20.
7. Julie D'Acci, *Defining Women: Television and the Case of* Cagney & Lacey (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1994).
8. Julie D'Acci, "Cultural Studies, Television Studies, and the Crisis in the Humanities," in *Television after TV: Essays on a Medium in Transition*, eds. Lynn Spigel and Jan Olsson (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004), 418–42.
9. Douglas Kellner, "Cultural Studies, Multiculturalism, and Media Culture," in *Gender, Race, and Class in Media: A Text-Reader*, eds. Gail Dines and Jean M. Humez (Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1995), 5–17.
10. Karl Marx, *Capital* (1867; London: George Allen and Unwin, 1948); Antonio Gramsci, *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, ed. and trans. Geoffrey Nowell Smith (1971; New York: International Publishers, 1997); Michel Foucault, *The History of Sexuality, Volume I: An Introduction*, trans. Robert Hurley (1976; New York: Vintage Books, 1990).
11. See Chapter 9 for a discussion of poststructuralist theory.
12. Kenneth Burke, *The Philosophy of Literary Form* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1941), 110–11.