*Will Robots Take Your Job?* is very well researched, yet short and succinct. It presents a wide range of arguments and provides a grand view of problems of technological unemployment. I strongly recommend the book to anyone who wants to learn more about the topic quickly, and to read about the main theories in the field without looking at (too many) primary sources. When it comes to solutions, however, Cameron is much more cautious. While some people may argue that we need more radical, or more straightforward, strategies and action plans, Cameron's approach is in line with an important point made by Brian Sudlow: 'nobody is quite sure what a world increasingly run by artificial intelligence will actually look like, or indeed how fast that world could evolve into something else entirely different' (Sudlow, 2018).

This is why *Will Robots Take Your Job?* is refreshing and relevant. From his experience as a technology writer and think-tank director, Cameron makes an important point that we need to build (social) consensus before we start acting. This does not indicate lack of vision; rather, it signals a democratic and open-minded view of the future. In line with this view, the book starts with a warning: 'A short book on a complex and controversial topic is a rather dangerous thing to write.' The author continues: 'the questions addressed here, at the meeting point of science, technology, and society, are questions for all of us'. In my opinion, this sentence is the key to the reading of Cameron's book because the chosen format – succinct, wide, and well researched – is an appropriate base point for reaching consensus. Cameron has managed to position his work in the wide spectrum of literature on technological unemployment as a succinct, powerful call to democratic action. Within a rapidly growing body of literature where authors develop this or that imaginary future to their own liking, this modest but hugely important volume should be taken very seriously.

## References

Peters, M., Jandrić, P. and Means, A., (eds). (2019) *Education and Technological Unemployment*, Springer, Singapore.

Sudlow, B. (2018) 'Review of Joseph E. Aoun, Robot proof: higher education in the age of artificial intelligence', *Postdigital Science and Education*, doi:10.1007/s42438-018-0005-8

Petar Jandrić
*Zagreb University of Applied Sciences, Croatia*
✉ pjandric@tvz.hr  ⓘ http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6464-4142

Check for updates

**Media anthropology for the digital age**, by Anna Cristina Pertierra, Cambridge, Polity, 2018, 177 pp, $US22.95 (paperback), ISBN: 978-1-50950-844-0

Almost 25 years ago, Spitulnik (1993, p.293) wrote: 'There is yet no anthropology of mass media. Even the intersection of anthropology and mass media appears rather small considering the published literature to date'. Her skepticism echoes in the terminolgy used by Latham (2012), 'this emerging sub-sub-subdiscipline'. On the other hand, Askew (2002, p.12) claims: 'Media anthropology, the brainchild of Mead, Bateson, and Powdermaker, has finally come into its own.' Postill (2009, p.334) shows the same enthusiasm: 'After long decades of neglect, the anthropological study of media is now booming.' And so does Bird

(1992, p.2): 'Our discipline came late to the field of media studies, but today the anthropology of media has come of age.'

In her attempt to both reflect these uncertainties and also legitimize this new academic field through a number of approaches, Anna Cristina Pertierra states: 'And for the time being, at least, there is plenty of work for anthropologists of media and digital culture to be getting on with' (p.158). Note the 'at least'. As one of those who have pleaded since the early 2000s for this discipline's recognition and empowerment, I can only be happy that a prestigious publishing house has published a synthesis on this theme. Every synthesis is also a manifest, a project that epistemologically justifies and empirically proves (by invoking a strong research current) the right to existence of media anthropology. However, things are not simple at all, and the debates are engulfed. This is obvious from oscillations and terminological uncertainties: Pertierra uses terms such as 'media anthropology', 'anthropology of media', 'anthropology of media and digital technologies', and 'anthropology of media and communication'. In addition, her book suggests, through its title, that media anthropology is on the way to becoming a new field, an anthropology of the digital world. So, how can we promote and empower a discipline, when it is only a bridge, a transition, between two stages, two (maybe more) legitimate areas of anthropology?

Pertierra's presentation oscillates between the anchoring of the new field *only* in the area of application of ethnographic research methods and the invocation of a specific theoretical framework, capable of validating a new sub-discipline of anthropology. The studies that originated from cultural anthropology (Askew and Wilk, 2002; Ginsburg *et al.*, 2003; Peterson, 2003; Postill, 2009) place the media anthropology *in* anthropology's interdisciplinary field (as the development of either applied or visual anthropology). Yet, the works coming from media studies (Bird, 1992; Couldry, 2003; Rothenbuhler and Coman, 2005) see media anthropology as *an* extension of communication studies. As a consequence, the interdisciplinary dialogue among anthropology, communication, media studies, and digital studies is a complex one, and might involve applying anthropology theories and methods in mass communication, media, and digital research. It might also include using media studies theories and concepts when investigating cultural and anthropological related phenomena. However, as Pertierra book shows, this has never really happened!

Pertierra's mission is not at all easy: anthropologists tend to ignore media (culture) and the digital world, and researchers in media studies or cultural studies tend to reduce anthropology to its consecrated method (ethnography), ignoring specific concepts and theories. Starting in the 1990s, they adopted the ethnographic techniques in a euphoric way; they did not develop any dialogue with anthropologists, nor with the critical bibliography connected to this field. Consequently, in the author's happy formulation: 'the purpose of this book, then, is to chart the mutual disinterest and subsequent love affair that has taken place between the fields of anthropology and media studies' (p.21). In this complicated context, Pertierra adds to the binary equation (the relationship between anthropology and media studies) the field of digital studies, itself a crossroads between several sciences and scientific paradigms. This complexity is probably the explanation of the heterogeneous structure of the book: the first two chapters are devoted to the relationship between anthropology (as a science) and mass media (as an object of study); another chapter investigates the relationship among cultural studies, media studies, and the ethnographic method. The next chapter approaches the use of ethnography in virtual worlds research, starting with discussion of mobile cultures and social media, proceeding to how

some anthropologists participate in the development of commercial or educational media products, and finishing with a return to the problems of ethnographic research. Thus, the emphasis in this presentation is not on the intersection of paradigms, theories, and concepts of the various sciences that meet, as much as on the methods of research and the challenge of their application to the mass media, new media, social media, and other forms of digital communication.

The presentations of the various approaches is clear and (inevitably) didactic. Pertierra pays commendable attention to the studies of media studies scholars, often focusing on the consumption of mass media in modern society. The best known are the investigations of the ethnography of reception, which were carried out mainly under the banner of cultural studies. This 'alliance of cultural and media studies with ethnography' (p.60) was not a result of an anthropological program, but emerged from a major theme of cultural studies – the role of culture in imposing the world view of dominant groups (hegemony). In the same way, although she mentions some ethnographic studies of media production, the author has paradoxically ignored the classical studies of the sociology of the newsroom, conducted in the 1970s and 1980s through intensive ethnographic observation in newsrooms.

Instead, many directions specific to the ethnography of digital world research (netnography, design ethnography, corporate ethnography, etc.) are mapped, which provides an integrative vision of this emerging field. Unfortunately, its vibrant and attractive presentation concentrates excessively on the actions (production, consumption and communication) and leaves the issue of contents untreated. I am thinking here of the rituals – the extraordinary rich field of media events studies, inspired by the classical work of Dayan and Katz (1992); I am thinking of the mythology – the full range of investigations of myths and archetypes in the media, but also in popular culture, digital games or social media; and I am thinking of religion in the media and digital world.

In the light of these debates, it is noticeable that the interdisciplinarity model developed is asymmetrical. Anthropology offers the conceptual frame, while the conceptual contribution of media studies disappears. In Pertierra's terms, 'media anthropologists drew from the founding principles of their intellectual tradition to produce accounts of media production and consumption' (p.155), thus contributing to 'de-centering the media in media studies' (p.156). It remains to be seen if translating the experience of media anthropology into digital anthropology will lead to a conceptual re-modeling of either. It may be, as with many of the studies presented in this synthesis, that the conceptual dominance of anthropology will persuade digital studies to borrow anthropological concepts while having no significant influence on the paradigmatic frames of canonical anthropology.

## References

Askew, K. (2002) 'Introduction' in Askew, K. and Wilk, R. (eds) *The Anthropology of Media*, Blackwell, London, pp. 1–13.

Askew, K. and Wilk, R. (eds) (2002) *The Anthropology of Media*, Blackwell, London.

Bird, E. (1992) *For Enquiring Minds: A Cultural Study of Supermarket Tabloids*, University of Tennessee Press, Knoxville.

Couldry, N. (2003) *Media Rituals: A Critical Approach*, Routledge, London.

Dayan, D. and Katz, E. (1992) *Media Events: The Live Broadcast of History*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA.

Ginsburg, F., Abu-Lughod, L. and Larkin, B. (2003) *Media Worlds: Anthropology in New Terrain*, University of California Press, Berkeley CA.

Latham, K. (2012) 'Anthropology, media and cultural studies' in Fardon, R., *et al.* (ed.) *SAGE Handbook of Social Anthropology*, Sage, Los Angeles, pp. 72–88.

Peterson, M. (2003) *Anthropology & Mass Communication: Media and Myth in the New Millenium*, Berghahn, New York.

Postill, J. (2009) 'What is the point of media anthropology?', *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale*, 17, 3, pp. 334–44. doi:10.1111/j.1469-8676.2009.00079_1.x.

Rothenbuhler, E. and Coman, M. (eds) (2005) *Media Anthropology*, Sage, London.

Spitulnik, D. (1993) 'Anthropology and mass media', *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 22, pp. 293–315. doi:10.1146/annurev.an.22.100193.001453.

Mihai Coman
*Bucharest University, Romania*
✉ mcoman53@yahoo.com

Ⓝ Check for updates

**Autonomous learning in the workplace**, by Jill E. Ellingson and Raymond A. Noe (eds), New York, Routledge, 2017, xxi+225 pp., A$89.00, ISBN: 978-1-138-94074-1

Autonomous learning in the workplace is an edited book that explores the shifting world of workplace learning. The editors' interest in their topic was derived from two insights (p. 2). First, appreciation of how people learn in the workplace is changing. Workplace learning now involves more than just attending formal training and development events and courses. Employees learn informally, for example, through talking to other employees and searching the internet. As well, there are now new autonomous learning methods, such as massive open online courses (MOOCs), communities of practice, social media and YouTube videos. The second insight was that little was known about individual differences and contextual factors influencing the use of autonomous learning and how to evaluate it. These two insights gave rise to this interesting edited collection of readings from contributors working in the fields of management, education and industrial/organizational psychology.

Just what is autonomous learning? How is it possible to distinguish it clearly enough from other forms of learning, at least clearly enough to warrant a consistent theme for an edited book? The editors state that autonomous learning is the ability of the learner to take charge of their own learning (p. 2). In addition to this, the editors warn that the term exhibits complexity, requiring a number of conditions to be added to what appears to be a simple concept. Autonomous learning must be voluntary, not imposed by the organization. It must also be unstructured, in that employees are not learning to meet pre-determined or pre-planned learning objectives. As well, autonomous learning must build human capital (employees gain information and skills that are relevant to their jobs). As if this list of conditions is not enough, the editors argue that autonomous learning encompasses several learning concepts that are perhaps better known: employee development, self-development, self-directed learning, voluntary employee development, workplace learning and informal learning. The definition of autonomous learning adopted in the book proves not to be unduly restrictive for contributors. Even amidst this sea of related terms, the 16 chapters broadly succeed in navigating around the constraints of definition.

The book is divided into four parts, in addition to the editors' introduction. Part I asks what constitutes a contemporary autonomous learning method. There are six chapters in this part which attempts to frame the concept of autonomous learning.