2010

Review of A. Hoskins and B. O'Loughlin's (2007) Television and Terror: Conflicting Times and the Crisis of News Discourse

Adam Hodges, *Stanford University*

could arguably strengthen the volume, but really, the value of the contributions in this text do speak for themselves. Although this volume is dedicated to the work of Gillian Sankoff and thus endeavors to mirror her work in Canada and Oceania, the broad scope of this book invites similar texts tackling other language communities.

Overall, this text is a worthwhile read for any sociolinguist, particularly because it challenges sociolinguists to rethink and/or redefine the types of questions that they ask and assume are valid for any given language situation. In addition, this volume of work adds depth to the sociolinguistic landscape by covering multilingual contact issues from a variety of perspectives, both qualitative and quantitative. In the end, this text proves to be exactly as the editors describe: 'Far from being a retrospective, the publication of this volume is an opportunity to consider and be inspired by the new directions in which Sankoff's research agenda continues to take the field' (p. 14). They continue, stating, (and this reviewer echoes), 'Gillian, thanks for providing such a splendid example of what to study and how to go about it doing it' (p. 15).

CLARE J. DANNENBERG
Linguistics Speech Lab
423 Shanks Hall
English Department, Mail Code 0112
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 24061-0112
U.S.A.

ANDREW HOSKINS AND BEN O'LOUGHLIN. *Television and Terror: Conflicting Times and the Crisis of News Discourse*. (New Security Challenges). Basingstoke, U.K.: Palgrave Macmillan. 2007. 217 pp. Hb (9780230002319) £45.00.

Reviewed by ADAM HODGES

Television and Terror, written by sociologist Andrew Hoskins and international relations scholar Ben O'Loughlin, investigates television news against the backdrop of the 'new media ecology' where events are not so much *mediated* as they are *mediatized* (Cottle 2006). The news is mediatized, the authors explain, in that the media are 'built into and constitutive of terror events' so that 'off-screen events become inseparable from media representations of those events' (p. 13). In particular, the authors examine television news coverage of Hurricane Katrina (Chapter 3) and the 2003 Iraq war (Chapter 4). They also pull data from 9/11 and the 7/7 London bombings (Chapter 5), draw examples from television drama and documentary (Chapter 7), and provide a glimpse into audience perceptions of terror events (Chapter 8). Throughout, they discuss issues such as television's emphasis on immediacy (Chapter 2), its use of the past in representing current and future threats (Chapter 5), and its representations – whether graphic or sanitized – of the injured and dead (Chapter 6).

Given that events such as the Iraq war and Hurricane Katrina are mediatized, the book aims to focus not just on the content of television news 'but on *how* this content is produced *in any specific instance*' (p. 4; italics in original). Hoskins and O'Loughlin draw from Kress and van Leeuwen's (2001) multimodal approach to textual analysis as well as the tradition of ethnomethodology where the focus is on *how* social interaction is organized. In their quest to unravel the norms and rules that organize television news and that allow for what is 'say-able', they also make use of Foucault's notion of discourse. Instead of the vague definition of 'rules' discussed by Foucault (1972), however, the authors attempt to 'identify economies, logics, and grammars followed and sustained by those producing news' (p. 11). These are approaches and aims that will certainly appeal to sociolinguists and critical discourse analysts. Nevertheless, the textual analysis actually provided in the book remains more sociological and less linguistic in nature (as has been attempted in Martin and Edwards 2004; Chouliaraki 2005; Hodges and Nilep 2007, for example), which may leave many sociolinguists wishing for more discourse data and detailed analysis of the micro-level interaction of television news.

Despite these desiderata, the strength of the book lies in its ability to communicate important ideas from media studies to a broad audience of scholars interested in media discourse. Notably, in Chapter 3, Hoskins and O'Loughlin provide a valuable discussion and critique of the so-called CNN effect, which is defined as the 'ability to feed in to and shape the event being covered by news programming' (p. 38). In doing so, they problematize the causal connection often drawn by those who study this issue. In their discussion, they provide useful background on the units of analysis and approaches found in the CNN effect literature. They then contrast these approaches with their own decidedly micro-sociological approach. Rather than an issue of control and influence, the authors focus on the 'anatomy of a news event'– that is, how television news unfolds. Instead of the media simply controlling and influencing policy through the dissemination of a discrete and coherent message, the authors highlight how television news coverage is often messy and contradictory. 'When we examine television coverage in this way, we see how problematic it is to speak of "effects"' (p. 56). From this perspective, it is less an issue of whether (or to what extent) television news controls policy than how television news effectively participates in the constitution of the event (and society more broadly).

In Chapter 8, Hoskins and O'Loughlin provide a useful model for thinking about the 'interaction order' in which public perceptions of reality are formed. They note that this interaction order is constituted by three linked and overlapping discursive realities: a political discursive reality, a media discursive reality, and an experiential discursive reality. 'Each discursive reality acts as a prism, through which some things are visible and others are not, or things are *seen as* this or that (Wittgenstein, 2002)' (p. 164; italics in original). As individuals operate within these overlapping discursive realities, perceptions

are formed. Rather than trying to tease apart the influence of one discursive reality over another in forming perceptions (which would be akin to studying the CNN effect in terms of causal connections, as discussed earlier), the authors set out to illustrate how they interact with one another. Toward these ends, the authors draw from ethnographic audience data to provide seven brief sketches of individuals. The aim here is to illustrate how these interviewees draw from the different discursive realities to form their perceptions. This incorporation of audience ethnography into the examination of television news could potentially be a strong point of the study. As it stands, however, it left this sociolinguist wanting to see more data and more discussion of those data to better understand 'the relation between media representations of terror and audiences' perceptions of terror' (p. 161). Nevertheless, the chapter does provide insight into the diversity of responses that citizens may draw from media coverage of terror events.

Central to the investigation in *Television and Terror* is the argument that television news is in 'crisis.' For the authors, this means that news, instead of living up to its ideal mission of providing credible and reliable information, is contributing to an era of insecurity. The authors argue that television news brings about this insecurity through the amplification, as well as containment of representations of terror. On the one hand, television news amplifies terror through its mediatization of events. Television values immediacy and operates within an 'economy of liveness' where imagery from a scene is brought into the room of the television viewer through the textual and graphic enhancements of 'televisuality.' The authors cite how the 'shock of 9/11 was amplified as television news' (p. 15). They then argue that if 'television structures, concentrates, and delivers the terror message to mass audiences,' it can itself be seen as a 'weapon of terror' (p. 130). On the other hand, television news contains threats. The shear repetition of images from war zones like Iraq, for example, leads to a certain saturation and familiarity with such scenes so that '"shock value" is a matter of ever-diminishing returns' (p. 189). Moreover, coverage tends to weave together new and different threats into the fabric of a familiar and common narrative, which reduces uncertainty. Television news also sanitizes violence through an 'economy of taste and decency.' Thus, although contradictory, these dual operations of television news (amplification and containment) lead to, as the authors argue, the crisis in news discourse that contributes to insecurity.

Overall, *Television and Terror* effectively describes how television news, through the mediatization of events, works to constitute the social reality in which we live. Although it may not provide the detailed textual analysis to which sociolinguists are accustomed, it nevertheless provides a fascinating read for anyone interested in the sociology of media and media discourse. In particular, it provides fodder for the argument that television can itself be hijacked as a weapon of terror as television news increasingly mediatizes events that take place in today's world.

REFERENCES

Chouliaraki, Lilie (ed.). 2005. *The Soft Power of Law: Legitimacy and Community in Iraq War Discourses*. Special issue of *Journal of Language and Politics* 4/1.

Cottle, Simon. 2006. *Mediatized Conflict: Developments in Media and Conflict Studies*. Maidenhead, U.K.: Open University Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1972. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon.

Hodges, Adam and Chad Nilep (eds.). 2007. *Discourse, War and Terrorism*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands/Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: John Benjamins.

Kress, Gunther and van Leeuwen, Theo. 2001. *Multimodal Discourse*. London: Arnold.

Martin, James R. and John Edwards (eds.). 2004. Special issue: Interpreting tragedy: The language of 11 September 2001. *Discourse & Society* 15(2–3).

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 2002. *Philosophical Investigations*. Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell.

ADAM HODGES
Stanford University
Linguistics Department
450 Serra Mall, Bldg. 460
Stanford, CA 94305-2150
U.S.A.
adam.hodges@stanford.edu

ELENA SEMINO. *Metaphor in Discourse*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press. 2008. 247pp. Hb (9780521867306) £55.00/$110.00 / Pb (978052 1686969) £19.99/$39.99.

Reviewed by JONATHAN CHARTERIS-BLACK

A contrast that is sometimes overplayed between the inaugural work on conceptual metaphor theory (Lakoff and Johnson 1980) and its subsequent development in a substantial body of work including Charteris-Black (2004), (2005), (2006), Deignan (2005), Goatly (1997), (2007), Koller (2004), Musolff (2004), and Musolff and Zinken (2008) is that the more recent work bases its understanding of metaphor in authentic instances of language use – often from the evidence of language corpora – while the earlier work relied on imagined examples of metaphor. *Metaphor in Discourse* continues the empirical tradition by analysis of metaphor in texts drawn primarily from four discursive areas: literature, politics, science and education. There are also investigations of metaphor in advertising, illness, and the British press as well as a chapter that discusses the role of corpus-based approaches in the study of metaphor. In this respect Semino's work might be more accurately entitled *Metaphor in Discourses* – she makes the distinction between the count noun and the non-count noun – and demonstrates convincingly and successfully the pervasiveness and diversity of purposes of metaphor in each of the discourses examined. However, a full understanding of the more abstract concept of 'discourse' perhaps also requires further generalisation from the discourses that are examined here.