

**Hynek Jeřábek: *Paul Lazarsfeld and the Origins of Communications Research*. London: Routledge, 2017, 146 pp.**

Paul Lazarsfeld is recognized today as one of the pioneering sociologists to research mass communication, and as such, as one who played a significant role in the shaping of communication studies as we know them today. For this reason, Professor Jerabek's publication, *Paul Lazarsfeld and the Origins of Communications Research*, is an important addition to the existing body of work on Lazarsfeld. Jerabek's monograph was originally written in Czech in 1997, when the author was studying the archives of the University of Konstanz. However, its recent publication in English not only makes this valuable study available to a much wider readership, it also gives the opportunity to reassess and evaluate Lazarsfeld's role in shaping communication studies, which emerged in the first half of the 20th century.

Focusing on the earlier part of Lazarsfeld's career, Jerabek's studies, among other topics, Lazarsfeld's initial intellectual influences and the context of his communication studies, his first radio studies in Austria and the US, as well as later studies from the period of World War II and shortly after (chapters two, three, four, and seven). In addition, chapter five is dedicated to two noteworthy studies conducted by Lazarsfeld's colleagues and an evaluation of Lazarsfeld's role in them, and chapter seven discusses related communication studies on daily perceptions of the media, such as radio listeners' habits and readers' relations to newspapers, as well as the character and role of influential figures in shaping local communities' opinions. By focusing on the formative years of communication studies, Jerabek is able to illuminate the theoretical and intellectual origins of Lazarsfeld's thought, trace their development over time and in different work environment (in Austria and in several places in the US), and evaluate Lazarsfeld's intellectual, methodological, and personal influence on the field of communications research.

According to Jerabek, Lazarsfeld's greatest contribution to communication studies was as

a teacher and educator (p. 6). For this reason, the monograph studies first of all the shaping of Lazarsfeld's own attitude to science, his role in forming research centers, and finally it reviews studies conducted by his colleagues and students. Focusing on these aspects enables Jerabek to assess the extent of Lazarsfeld's influence on the formation of communication studies. Lazarsfeld's greatest influence as a sociologist in general, and in the field of communication studies in particular, lies in six aspects: 1. He founded and successfully directed four research institutes (one in Vienna and three in the US); 2. At these institutes he "developed a sociological research system in the form of a workshop" (p. 133) – a framework through which he was able to instruct and supervise younger colleagues; 3. Lazarsfeld advanced the participation of junior colleagues in actual research, thereby affording them the opportunity to gain practical research experience; 4. He combined commercial and academic research with the triple intent of acquiring funds, progressing the development of sociology as an academic field, and ensuring that studies will produce practical results; 5. He developed sociological methodology in the areas of data collection, conceptualization, modeling social phenomenon, as well as tools for data analysis; 6. He encouraged interdisciplinary cooperation of researchers from various fields and with different specializations, as well as the use of a wide array of research techniques, both quantitative and qualitative.

What all these points seem to have in common is a systematically open approach to research, which defies rigid borders between disciplines, academic, political, and commercial fields, and social hierarchy. It is interesting to see how this interdisciplinary approach originated quite early in Lazarsfeld's intellectual development and therefore it deserves special attention. Jerabek traces Lazarsfeld's predilection for hybrid thinking and action all the way back to Lazarsfeld's formative years in Vienna. Lazarsfeld himself testified to this early influence when he said, "my background was politics and mathematics and a European humanistic training" (p. 7). Lazarsfeld's parents were also responsible for his interdisciplinary tendency: whereas his

father was a lawyer, his mother, Sophie Lazarsfeld, was an Adlerian therapist, and their household often teemed with Jewish, intellectual, social democrat friends. Lazarsfeld was influenced by the unusual combination of Marxist, social-democratic political ideals on the one hand, and Adler's individual psychology, on the other, a synthesis he attempted to implement as an educational tool in youth camps he organized at the age of 23. This synthesis of sociology and psychology perhaps prefigures Lazarsfeld's characteristic employment of both quantitative and qualitative research technique, a combination which he would retain and pass forward to his students. An additional source of influence, which ultimately prevailed over Marx's and Adler's was Karl and Charlotta Bühler's developmental psychology. The involvement with the Böhlers, which culminated, among other things, in Lazarsfeld's first publication *Youth and Occupation* (co-written with Charlotta Bühler), also marked the beginning of Lazarsfeld's academic sociological research (notwithstanding that he earned his degree in applied mathematics) (p. 10). However, even in his early academic research Lazarsfeld resisted the restrictions of the academia, and sought the cooperation of external factors, such as economists, company directors, industrialists, and other market leaders. This cooperation was, at least initially, pursued for economic motives, but it became a staple of Lazarsfeld's work, which he would impart to his colleagues and students (p. 135). In fact, Lazarsfeld brought not only external resources and partners to the academy, but he was also one of the first to use empirical research *within* the academy, uncommon in the extremely theoretical environment of the 1930s academy, thereby shaping and influencing this developing field. Another characteristic of Lazarsfeld's work which Jerabek traces to these formative years, is the importance Lazarsfeld found in working in large teams which consisted both of junior researchers, as well as a large proportion of women, the most well-known being Herta Herzog, who also became Lazarsfeld's wife, at a time when such a principle was far from obvious. Finally, a more formal manifestation of Lazarsfeld's idiosyncratic attitude can be found

in his self-description as a "social psychologist" (p. 3).

Proof of Lazarsfeld's enduring interdisciplinary approach Jerabek finds in the third Radio Research Yearbook (1949) in which Lazarsfeld and Frank Stanton formulated principles of wider validity which guided both Lazarsfeld and his school in the last 20 years of his work in communication research (p. 130). These include the emphasis on the benefits of combining statistical knowledge, laboratory experiment findings, analytic psychologist observations, and sociologist's interpretations, in addition to the conviction that "the most useful results stem from the combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches" (ibid.).

In order to establish Lazarsfeld's importance and influence as a communication research scientist, Jerabek devotes chapter five to reviewing two studies conducted by colleagues of Lazarsfeld at the Princeton Radio Research Project: a research on the public panic that followed Orson Welle's radio broadcast of *The War of the Worlds* (by Hadley Cantril, Herta Herzog, and Hazel Gaudet), and a study of mass persuasion, following the successful sale of war bonds following a full day broadcast by popular radio announcer Kate Smith (by Robert K. Merton). According to Jerabek, while Lazarsfeld did not actually prepare these studies, he initiated and financed them, and was involved in both to a varying degree (pp. 81–82). Jerabek presents two clear instances in which Lazarsfeld contributed to the public panic research: in the first case he suggested that the reason Welles received an overwhelming number of positive letters from listeners following the broadcast, was that negative letters were sent to Federal Communications Commission; in the second case Lazarsfeld influenced the research by suggesting that what was puzzling in the event, and should therefore be clarified by the research, was not that people got scared by the broadcast, but that they weren't able to verify that its authenticity (pp. 89–90). These two instances are interesting not only because they provide an insight into Lazarsfeld's thought process, but also because they emphasize Lazarsfeld's ability to rephrase research questions and thereby reach

more meaningful research conclusions. Lazarsfeld's contribution to the war bonds research, however, is more ambiguous, although Jerabek makes it clear that Lazarsfeld at least came up with the idea the study.

Lazarsfeld's contribution is in no way limited to his role as educator. As Jerabek demonstrates, through the research centers he founded Lazarsfeld played a central role in advancing social-empirical sociology at a time when theoretical sociology was the dominant school. The lack of attention empirical sociology suffered required scientists such as Lazarsfeld to develop methodologies, research manuals, and data processing techniques, to train research teams, and procure funds from external sources at a time when neither the academy nor the state would allot funds for such research (p. 132).

In conclusion, *Paul Lazarsfeld and the Origins of Communications Research* is an interesting work which provides meaningful insights into the personal and professional contributions of Paul Lazarsfeld to the emerging field of communications study. Jerabek's work will be useful to non-Czech speaking researchers who are interested both in the history of 20th century sociology and communications research, but also to those studying Lazarsfeld's life and his psychological and social background. On a wider scale, it provides interesting insights into the early formation of a field of studies in the 20th century, as well as into the ways in which communication research can help us understand the role of mass communication and media in contemporary society.

Adam Coman

DOI: 10.14712/23363525.2019.10

**Jan Štemberk: *Pěšky, na lyžích, na kole, lodí či autem. K dějinám československé turistiky v letech 1945–1968.* Pelhřimov: Nová tiskárna Pelhřimov, 2017, 281 s.**

Na přelomu zimy a jara 2018 spatřila světlo světa kniha dnes již jednoho z klíčových tuzemských odborníků na moderní a soudobé dějiny cestovního ruchu, Jana Štemberka. Autor, jinak

absolvent oborů historie a slovenistika na Filozofické fakultě a také oboru právo na Právnické fakultě Univerzity Karlovy, již dlouhá léta působí na Vysoké škole obchodní v Praze a též na Fakultě humanitních studií Univerzity Karlovy, v roce 2011 se habilitoval na FF UK v oboru hospodářských a sociálních dějin a od roku 2017 je jeho působištěm také Pracoviště historické sociologie Fakulty humanitních studií Univerzity Karlovy.

Ve své nejnovější publikaci autor, taktéž specialista na dějiny dopravy, navazuje na svá předešlá a časem systematicky postupující bádání o dějinách cestovního ruchu a to zejména období tzv. první československé republiky (srovnej: *Fenomén cestovního ruchu. Limity a možnosti cestovního ruchu v meziválečném Československu*, 2009). Zároveň se ovšem opírá o své pilotní sondy do problematiky transformace některých segmentů sféry cestovního ruchu v období první světové války a také po jejím skončení, a to včetně dějin turistiky. V kontextu dosavadního bádání jak historiografie tuzemské, tak i zahraniční, je další knižní přírůstek na téma s důrazem na dějiny organizované turistiky možné jen přivítat, neboť dosavadní souborný zájem o problematiku soudobých dějin české a česko(-)slovenské turistiky a jejích dobových aktérů byl spíše okrajový, případně byl alternován pouze výstupy regionálního zaměření. Co do metodologického vymezení se Štemberkova práce pohybuje na pomezí politických, hospodářských, sociálních a dílem též kulturních dějin, a to v poměrně dlouhém časovém horizontu více než dvou „po-druhoválečných“ desetiletí. Tato značně rozkročená perspektiva klade na autora obrovské nároky na detailní znalost problematiky, ale také schopnost tu více, tu méně provázaných tématech srozumitelně pojednat na pozadí dobového kontextu a zároveň na relativně omezeném textovém rozsahu. To se podle mého soudu autorovi vzhledem k jeho historicko-právní specializaci a především díky jeho bohatým zkušenostem s podobně koncipovaným typem monografických i kolektivních prací úspěšně daří.

Mezi hlavní přednosti recenzované publikace patří především fakt, že její autor se v hojné míře snaží těžit z bohatství široké palety