

Any typology that structures and labels elements of a complex scholarly literature is subject to some inevitable arbitrariness. We readily acknowledge that other organizational structures may be of equal validity and perhaps greater intellectual provocation and productivity and would welcome them. A selection of other publications or another operationalization of intellectual linkage might have revealed dramatically different patterns. But we believe a case can be made that there is value in self-consciously examining the process of theoretical accumulation and moving beyond the seductive siren call of pronouncements about how not-so-minimal media effects really are.

Notes

- 1 This typology evolved from a collaborative process of the authors reading and discussing the sample of 200 most frequently cited articles in search of common problematics and thematics. It was basically an iterative process of clustering and reclustered and then labeling similar papers and then seeking out common theoretically seminal citations. Having derived the basic typology, we discovered that it looked strikingly similar to several others in the literature as noted, which we took to be a good sign. Accordingly, we stake no claim to originality or exclusivity. An entirely different way of clustering this literature could be of value and provide other insights into the character of theoretical aggregation and various impediments to aggregation. We hasten to draw readers'

attention to limitations of any single empirical exercise, such as this one. We are constrained by the time period of available data, the limited subsample of journals in the field, the absence of an analysis of lesser-cited articles, the limited sample of "seminal" studies, and possible errors in ISI data and data processing (particularly because of typographical errors). Any typology is subject to criticism. For example, we have grouped cognitive dissonance and social identity literatures together in the active audience category because they both represent forms of "motivated attention." Audience members selectively attend to sources that are like them (identity theory) and are likely to agree with them (cognitive dissonance.) Reviewers have correctly pointed out that the structure of cognitive dissonance and identity theory are quite different. Had they been exemplified separately, however, it would not have significantly changed the analysis. Reviewers have also pointed out that many scholars consider ELM to be a classic example of a persuasion theory and should be more appropriately listed under that heading. However, unlike the characteristic research paradigm of the early persuasion research, which emphasized an undifferentiated audience and paid little attention to the cognitive dynamics of selective attention and deliberation, the ELM model introduces the concept of the thoughtful/evaluative "central route" (i.e., active audience) as opposed to the unthinking "peripheral route." We include it under the active audience heading because the emphasis on elaboration is just the kind of active cognitive behavior and motivated attention that defines the cluster.