

The Review of Communication, 7 (1-January), 2007

2007 National Communication Association

ISSN: Print/1535-8593 On-line

DOI: 10.1080/15358590500420480

Editor's Page

Raymie E. McKerrow*

* Raymie E. McKerrow is 2007-2009 Review of Communication Editor. Inquiries regarding ROC, especially for preliminary feedback on extended reviews, cross-cultural communication reviews, and in retrospect reviews, should be directed to mckerrow@ohio.edu.

Approved in November 1999, *Review of Communication (ROC)* was first published by the National Communication Association (NCA) in July 2001. This refereed, *online only* journal publishes reviews. The first editor of this volume, Thomas W. Benson of The Pennsylvania State University, described the aim of *ROC* in these words: "The *Review of Communication* reviews books in all fields of human communication, including scholarly books, textbooks, and appropriate trade books." The second editor, James Chesebro, has continued that commitment, as will this editor.

Under the supervision of the NCA Publications Board and with the advice of Taylor & Francis, during 2002 and the first half of 2003, *ROC* underwent a major refocus. The refocusing was intended to extend the role of NCA in the digital publishing market, provide NCA with an online publication that is, by design, more comprehensive, integrated, critical, and international in its approach to the review of new publications that in some way impact, inform, or otherwise contribute to ongoing research in the communication discipline. The refocus was first reflected in the January–April 2004 issue, and continues with the issues under my editorship. A *Journal Advisory Board* has been created to assist in acquiring state of the art reviews/reviewers. *ROC encourages submission of a wide variety of review formats as well as review subjects.*

Review Formats

First, a review may focus on a **single book**, with a goal of illustrating its singular value or importance to the communication discipline, by focusing attention on issues of process, method and/or mode of inquiry in relation to communication concepts, principles or practices.

Second, a review may deal with **multiple books** (normally 3-6 or 7 texts are included in a more extensive review essay). These extended reviews seek to develop a thesis regarding the interrelationships (complementary or conflicting) among the volumes reviewed. Necessarily, the viewpoint of the reviewer and the specific thesis initiated about the books being reviewed become the governing and controlling perspective of the review. Thus, the central focus of these reviews is more "reviewer-centered" than "text/author centered." As with more conventional essays, additional references to articles and/or other books may be included to buttress the reviewer's perspective or argument (but are NOT essential to the review process).

Third, as an alternative to an "integrated theme" approach, more extensive reviews may also be formatted much like an annotated bibliography—with each book listed separately with an accompanying paragraph or more noting its central features/value. These reviews should have a specific thematic unity that ties the multiple texts (10-12 or more) together. In the July–October 2004 issue of *ROC*, for example, David T. McMahan provided an annotated bibliography entitled "Media Scholarship—From Cartoons to Political Upheaval: An Annotated Bibliography in Media Studies."

Fourth, the book or books reviewed can be a **trade book**, **scholarly book**, or **textbook**. The book(s) should have been published **2005 or later**. A review of a single book is normally no more than 1,000 words, while the length of an extended review is regulated by the number of books substantively examined in the extended review (normally 1,000 words per volume). As a guideline (but not a rule), single text reviews may run 1-4 published pages, while more extensive reviews may run 12-18 pages or more.

Non-Book-based Disciplinary Reviews

While the above review formats focusing on books remains the primary goal, we also encourage extended reviews that provide a critical examination of any materials defining the discipline of communication. As above, these reviews should examine contemporary issues, problems, research foci, and offer critical assessments of the nature, scope or direction of materials which assist in advancing the discipline's research goals. Contacting the Editor in advance is especially encouraged if interested in submitting a review that moves in this direction.

Review Subjects

The intent in what follows is to elicit interest in a variety of subject areas; it is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather purely suggestive of the kinds of reviews/subjects that would be of interest to communication teacher-scholars.

Cross-Cultural Communication Reviews

Committed to the comparison of the study of communication in different countries, cross-cultural communication reviews compare the study of communication in two different countries. A representative sample of recently published communication books in one country is compared to a recently published sample of communication books in another country. Given the scope of such an endeavor, such a comparison will necessarily be selective in terms of the areas of communication compared. For example, *ROC* published a comparison of communication research in Australia/New Zealand and the United States in the July–October 2004 issue and January 2005 issues of *ROC*. In addition, in the January 2005 issue, this study compares current communication research in the United States and South Korea. Through a thematic meta-analysis of 782 recent communication books published between 2002 and 2004 (413 from the US and 369 from South Korea), it compares the current status of communication research in the US and South Korea in general, and then focuses on the status of research in each nation on the Internet in particular. Because such comparisons can easily be overwhelming, the comparison might, for example, be narrowed by focusing predominantly on the research methods involved in the study of organizational communication and media in Australia/New Zealand and the US. NCA's recent approval of a new Cross-Cultural Communication journal will mesh well with this general category of reviews.

In terms of future plans for *ROC*, it is particularly hoped that a communication scholar in China and an American communication scholar might undertake a comparison of communication study in selective areas in both countries. For the immediate future, all such cross-cultural communication reviews must be in English, should be from 5,000 to 10,000 words (longer reviews may be published in two different but subsequent issues), and should focus on books (trade books, scholarly books, and/or textbooks) published in 2004 or later.

In Retrospect Reviews

“In Retrospect Reviews” deal with the history of the discipline of communication, and particularly with an historical event, scholar, issue, or past event important to the contemporary study of communication. For example, the first review published in volume one, number one, of *Review of Communication* featured the scholarly contributions of Henry W. Johnstone, Jr., written by Gerald A. Hauser, with a specific focus on reviving the dialogue of philosophy and rhetoric. In the July 2004 issue, Jane Blankenship explored the scholarly contributions and implications of the scholarship of Marie Hochmuth Nichols. In the July–October 2004 issue of *ROC*, Judith S. Trent provided an analysis of “Henrietta Prentiss, President of the National Communication Association in 1932: A Retrospective.” In the January 2005 issue, Sharon A. Ratliffe provided an analysis of Maud May Babcock (1867–1954), who was President of the National Communication Association in 1936. Equally useful, a reviewer might also focus on the celebrated contributions of a school of thought or philosophical perspective, or an historical event. In all cases, the reviewer is expected to argue explicitly – in the review itself – why and how the object of study is relevant to contemporary communication analyses. Such reviews should be approximately 5,000 to 7,500 words in length.

Professional Issues Reviews

The field of communication is not immune to professional pressures felt by those who serve as adjuncts, or those who have been denied tenure or promotion, or have been challenged to further “engage” their students through “active” or “service” learning. Higher education is replete with studies of these and other professional issues (such as graduate education reform); the goal of this subject area is to feature studies that, while not “communication centered” certainly affect the professional lives of all faculty. The key criterion is to illustrate the importance of these issues to the communication discipline, by indicating the central role such subjects play in our lives. As an example, Betty Farmer’s “Mentoring Communication” review essay highlighted 15 recent books related to mentoring behaviors in an “annotated” format.

Classics Reviews

What are the texts that have “stood the test of time” within the discipline—that would be useful to reconsider for what they might say to a new generation of scholars, or contribute to current trends in research? We have moved so far from older texts such as Berlo’s *The Process of Communication* or Black’s *Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method*, or other theoretical works that have had a major impact on the nature and direction of our scholarship, that it may well be useful to revisit such texts as an invitation to consider their influence for our present time. A contrary approach is to consider books which did not get attention at the time, but have more recently emerged as central to our present thinking. This approach parallels *Reviews in American History* which typically publishes one such review per issue. For our purposes, such texts should be published at least 25 years in the past (e.g., 1980 or before).

Process Issues

Samples of past issues of this journal are available on the NCA webpage (www.natcom.org) or on the Taylor & Francis website (<http://taylorandfrancis.metapress.com>). The most convenient way to access the journal is to work from the NCA webpage, using your NCA ID and NCA password.

All reviews must be **submitted online only**. All reviews should be submitted online and in English through the journal’s **Manuscript Central** website at: <http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/rroc>. New users should first create an account.

Once a user is logged onto the site, submissions should be made via the Author Centre. The “create an account” button can be found at the top right corner of that page.

All reviews should conform to the style sheet requirements of the American Psychological Association, specifically the fifth edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 2001).

Upon notification of acceptance, authors must assign copyright to the National Communication Association.

As you read this issue, I hope you find the reviews useful and helpful in your work in the discipline of communication as well as intellectually provocative and challenging. I also hope the issue stimulates and encourages you to submit to me a review of a recent publication.