

MEDIA, SOCIETY, AND THE DEMOCRATIC FABRIC
INTERPLAY OF INFORMATION AND GOVERNANCE

MEDIA, SOCIETY, AND THE DEMOCRATIC FABRIC
INTERPLAY OF INFORMATION AND GOVERNANCE

Dr. M.Govindaraj





ALEXIS PRESS

Published by: Alexis Press, LLC, Jersey City, USA
www.alexispress.us

© RESERVED

This book contains information obtained from highly regarded resources.
Copyright for individual contents remains with the authors.
A wide variety of references are listed. Reasonable efforts have been made
to publish reliable data and information, but the author and the publisher
cannot assume responsibility for the validity of
all materials or for the consequences of their use.

No part of this book may be reprinted, reproduced, transmitted,
or utilized in any form by any electronic, mechanical, or other means,
now known or hereinafter invented, including photocopying,
microfilming and recording, or any information storage or retrieval system,
without permission from the publishers.

For permission to photocopy or use material electronically
from this work please access alexispress.us

First Published 2023

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Media, Society, and the Democratic Fabric: Interplay of Information and Governance
by *Dr. M.Govindaraj*
ISBN 979-8-89161-814-5

CONTENTS

Chapter 1. Understanding Media and Society: A Comprehensive Review	1
— <i>Dr. M.Govindaraj</i>	
Chapter 2. Characteristics and Importance of Media Audiences.....	9
— <i>Dr. M.Govindaraj</i>	
Chapter 3. Analyzing the Key Functions of Media Literacy.....	18
— <i>Dr. M.Govindaraj</i>	
Chapter 4. Obstacles in Adopting Media Policies: A Review Study	25
— <i>Dr. M.Govindaraj</i>	
Chapter 5. Traditional and Modern Means of Communication.....	32
— <i>Dr. M.Govindaraj</i>	
Chapter 6. Theories of the Mass Media: An Analysis	39
— <i>Dr. M.Govindaraj</i>	
Chapter 7. World Triumph and Domestic Decline: A Review Study	47
— <i>Dr. Sumbul Samreen</i>	
Chapter 8. Media Cultures: Comparing American and British Approaches to News Reporting and Journalism.....	56
— <i>Dr. Syed Kazim</i>	
Chapter 9. Media's Role in Perpetuating Socioeconomic Disparities: A Critical Examination of American Media and Political Culture.....	64
— <i>Dr. Uma C Swadimath</i>	
Chapter 10. Media System, Public Knowledge and Democracy	71
— <i>Prof Minerva Das</i>	
Chapter 11. Exploring the Entertainment and Identity Politics	78
— <i>Dr. Pradeep Kumar R</i>	
Chapter 12. Exploring Gender Norms, Collective Identity, and Democratic Engagement in the series “Sex and the City”	86
— <i>Dr. Salma Begum</i>	

CHAPTER 1

UNDERSTANDING MEDIA AND SOCIETY: A COMPREHENSIVE REVIEW

Dr. M. Govindaraj, Associate Professor
Department of Marketing, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.govindarajm@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Media plays a pivotal role in shaping societal norms, attitudes, and behaviors, influencing the way individuals perceive themselves and the world around them. This abstract delves into the intricate relationship between media and society, examining how various forms of communication, including traditional mass media and digital platforms, impact social structures and cultural landscapes. Through a multidisciplinary approach drawing from sociology, communication studies, and cultural analysis, this exploration seeks to elucidate the complex interplay between media and societal dynamics. Central to this understanding is the concept of media convergence, wherein traditional boundaries between different forms of media blur, and giving rise to new modes of interaction and information dissemination. Furthermore, the abstract examines the influence of media ownership and control, as well as the proliferation of user-generated content, on shaping public discourse and ideological frameworks. Moreover, the abstract highlights the role of media literacy in empowering individuals to critically engage with media messages, discerning between fact and fiction in an era of rampant misinformation and digital manipulation. It also addresses the implications of media representation and portrayal, particularly in relation to issues of diversity, equity, and social justice.

KEYWORDS:

Community, Democracy, Entertainment, Gender Norms, Identity Politics, Media.

INTRODUCTION

The media and society depend on each other. Society has been around for millions of years, and the media, like newspapers and TV, has only been around for a little over 100 years. But they both need each other to survive. Society needs good communication to survive and grow. Communication helps people get information, learn new things, and have fun. In this section, we will talk about important topics concerning media and society like who watches it, understanding media, and the rules for media. This analysis is important because the media, especially the news, can quickly change policies and challenge those in power for the good of the public. They act as a watchdog in a democracy. The new media is also expected to talk about issues for the public, express what the public thinks, and bring up topics for discussion and debate. Over time, the news media has become very common, and some people see it as a powerful institution. Actually, when people talk about the mass media, they usually have very different opinions. Some people think that the media has a lot of power, while others believe that the media doesn't really affect people's lives. No matter what you think, it's clear that the media is now a normal part of everyone's daily life. A society is a group of people who live in the same area and follow similar rules and customs. A group of people can be the same or different from each other. A homogenous society is when everyone in the group has the same values, language, religion, and ethnicity. Some examples of these societies are the Japanese, Chinese, Native American, and Zulu societies.

A heterogeneous society is where there are many different kinds of people with different races, cultures, and religions. The USA is a good example of a diverse society because there are people of different races. Sure, could you please provide the text you'd like me to simplify? White people, Asian people, black people, and Hispanic people, and so on. People live there, but they have different beliefs and languages, but most of them can speak English. Communication is important for connecting different levels of society. Mass media shows us what society is like through news and entertainment. On a small scale, people learn about different groups based on their caste, customs, religion, or beliefs through talking to others or watching media. It is often seen in the media to talk about different groups of people, like castes and communities. In India, the news often talks about how people from different backgrounds vote during elections. Media reports on events and protests happening among people from different castes. Many caste groups are protesting to get special spots in government jobs and school and college admissions. The Jat protest in 2016 in Haryana caused a lot of damage to public things and the Gujjar protest in 2019 in Rajasthan led to trains being stopped. These are two examples. Most newspapers separate marriage ads by gender and caste. The examples are given to show how media shapes and influences what happens in a society or group. People who work in the media are from the same social background as everyone else, so their writings and opinions may show their personal beliefs [1], [2].

Historical background

Even without newspapers, radio, or TV, people still spread their ideas widely. People were contacted through meetings, gatherings, talking to each other, rumors, and writings on different subjects like religion and citizens' rights. Now, we will quickly mention some important points to connect to our main discussion. King Ashoka's remains are still on the iron pillars that have the teachings of Lord Buddha written on them. They have lasted for thousands of years and can still be seen today. He also sent people to spread Buddhism in many countries. This didn't rely on any modern media. The mass media we have now is around 100 years old and started when newspapers became cheap to buy. The time was called the era of Penny Press [3], [4].

During the First World War, the press and radio were used to support and promote the war goals of different countries. This shows how the media can greatly influence a large group of people, leading them to support and work towards war goals. By 1925, many people thought that mass advertising could control people and affect relationships between countries. Thinkers in the late 1800s knew that things were changing very quickly. The old way of changing slowly was being replaced by a much faster way. The history of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union showed that mass media can be used by the government to spread messages that support the people in power. Hitler and Goebbels thought that the media could spread their ideas to the public. They also thought that if a lie was told many times, people might start to believe it. Hitler may have been one of the first powerful men to understand the power of pictures and the media. After World War II, we saw a lot of new media that changed how we live. In the process of growth, people realized that the media is important and everyone, including developing countries, paid attention to it.

The media is sometimes seen as always wanting to know the newest and most exciting news. But in a democracy, it's important for the media to watch over the government and make sure people know what they are doing. The media can make the government explain what they do and why, which affects the people they represent. In some places, people think the media represents them. So, the laws about free speech and free press are seen as important for the public good. The government should not try to limit the news media because it goes against the people's right to get true and fair information. During the Emergency in India in 1975-77, the government controlled what the press could report. The Indian Express showed that

editorial censorship was happening by leaving blank spaces in its articles. Other newspapers including the Statesman quickly started using the metaphor of censorship from the blank editorial. Today, in the time of global connections, mass media has changed a lot. Many people say that news media has turned into a product for sale. The media is being criticized for showing a lot of violence. Leftist people think that the media helps the rich and powerful people to keep their control on society [5], [6].

DISCUSSION

Now, let's see how the media has changed in the age of information. With the arrival of modern times and the increase in mass media, societies around the world have experienced big changes in how they can reach and use the media.

The media has been very important in making our world more modern. It has helped people become more connected to their country, think for themselves, focus on facts, have more say in how things are run, separate religion from daily life, and live in cities. Today, almost everything people do is connected to or relies on the media. Almost everyone uses media in some way. According to the news, there will be more mobile phones than people soon. Smartphones are small and have lots of media on them like newspapers, TV, movies, and social media. They help people talk to each other one-on-one and in groups. Information now travels very quickly, almost as fast as a person's thoughts. The Internet has made the world more connected, breaking down barriers like where people live, their background, and their beliefs. Later on, we will talk about the good and bad things that come with the new media, especially on the Internet in different countries and around the world. In a democracy, the media is really important because the government needs to have the support of the people. The media plays a big part in politics because of this. The government uses mass media to communicate with people.

News media serves as a connection between the government and the people, sharing information and sometimes having its own opinions. When the media says good things, politicians like it and use it against their opponents. But when the media says bad things, politicians say the media is being unfair to them. Geoffrey Craig says that politicians and political figures have personal influence over the media and can control it in a less official way. Craig says that you can easily see how political people influence the media every day. Governments can make laws that put a lot of pressure on the media. People say that governments have too much control over the media. They decide what information can be shared, and when and how it can be shared. Politicians use the media to communicate through events, briefings, news conferences, interviews, and photos.

The media likes to report on information from important sources, even if it's not always true. As mentioned before, who owns the media affects what is shown. Big business owns most of the media in the world, more than 90%. In India, the past 20 years have been very important. Different types of people and groups have a share in media companies. This includes politicians, political groups, businesses, and big media companies, both at a national and international level. Media ownership does two important things for the owners. First, it makes them money. And second, it gives them a way to express their opinions [7], [8].

For instance, Reliance Industries has invested in over 25 media channels and newspapers. This is something that everyone should be worried about, especially people who study and judge things. Let's say there is some bad news about one of the RIL companies. It would be interesting to see how the media companies and newspapers that have a stake in RIL cover that news. It might take a while to understand how it affects these media companies.

Rules versus controlling yourself

In democracies, the news media can speak freely. But it's strange that in democratic countries, the government often tries to control or regulate the media. India is one of these countries. The emergency on June 25th, 1975, led to widespread censorship and intimidation of the media. Some newspapers did not give in to the control of the content that many others followed. They prefer to have a blank editorial or news report instead of publishing one that has been censored. The Congress party lost the 1977 elections and the Prime Minister at the time, Mrs. Indira Gandhi did not win her own seat. After a crisis, the journalists and their organizations have worked hard to oppose government rules when necessary. The argument about whether the government should control media or if it should regulate itself has been going on for a long time. Each side argues the pros and cons of having rules for media compared to letting it be free.

Some critics say the government has a way of controlling the media that they think is hard for the media to resist. The Indian government, both national and regional, spend lots of money on ads in newspapers and TV. Critics believe that governments secretly control them by not giving them advertising support. Some journalists criticized the India Shining campaign and the Bharat Nirman campaigns for spending taxpayers' money. They said that the media didn't criticize the campaigns much because they were making money from advertising for them. Communication expert Geoffrey Craig says that recently, governments have become better at understanding the needs and role of the media. Craig believes that politicians have more power now because the media relies too much on the information given by them. He says that people not trusting politics is because of this. This has made more people able to understand political messages in the media [9], [10].

The media is seen as both shaping and influencing what the public thinks. It is thought that when news is shared with the public, it gives different viewpoints that help people understand and form opinions about what is happening around them. The media can also change how people think by sharing their opinions and arguments. American social scientist Kimball Young believes that public opinion is the community's thoughtful decision on an important issue after discussing it publicly. Public opinion is shaped by people's spoken attitudes, beliefs, and strong feelings, along with the images and ideas that go with them. People's thoughts and feelings about something can change during difficult times when they don't agree on how to understand the situation. He says that public opinion has changed because there are now many more things that can influence it. American sociologist Herbert Blumer believed that public opinion is how people interact with each other. When people have a problem, they talk about it and try to come up with solutions together. The Spiral of Silence theory says that the media has a strong influence on public opinion and can make people reluctant to express different opinions. Noelle-Neumann thought that the media has a lot of influence on how people see the world because they cover important events and different viewpoints. He says that the media shows the popular opinion in society. Doris A Graber talks about articles that say journalists show bias against marginalized groups by portraying them in a negative way. The writers believe that there are specific ways that news is presented, and these ways depend on the storyteller's culture [11], [12].

Elizabeth M Perse examines how the news media can influence what people think is important in politics, using the Agenda Setting Theory. In simple terms, she says that the news media choose what to show and emphasize, such as events, people, and issues. When people hear the same stories over and over in the news, they start to think those stories are more important than others that aren't talked about as much. American sociologists Lazarsfeld and Merton believed that the media helps to show who and what is important in society. They said the media does

this by bringing attention to important people, events, and issues. The news media don't just focus on certain topics. Studies have shown that the way news is delivered can influence how people perceive and think about different issues and events. In 2013, heavy rains caused a cloudburst in Uttarakhand, which flooded the area. The event made people in their homes see the damage caused in the Himalayan state by nature's power for many weeks.

The media didn't just focus on rescuing stranded pilgrims, it also showed how developers and authorities didn't care about the environment in the Himalayas to make money. It also pointed out that many government agencies were not ready to handle such a big crisis.

The news made people aware of the crisis in the Himalayas. It warned that there could be more disasters if everyone, especially the government, didn't take care of the environment there. The news channels were asking the political leaders tough questions about their careless attitude, especially after a report from the Comptroller and Auditor General warned about the impact of construction work on the state. The media talked about how political parties were using a human disaster to try to gain support and blame each other. The media tells people what's happening in the world. People who watch news are influenced by what they see on the news.

Relationship between Media and Society

Media companies are a part of our community. The news media needs to be free and fair because it helps keep an eye on important things. The news should closely monitor the government, businesses, and other organizations. It is expected to bring up problems for people to talk about and discuss. The government needs to protect the press and make sure that news is shared freely and fairly with the public. This is to make sure that people who rely on the news to stay informed and connected to the world. The media should report news without being influenced and should also help people express their opinions on important issues. Media connects the public to the people in charge.

The influence of new media on society

In the 1970s, new media was created because of advances in technology and changes in society, politics, and beliefs. The word became well-known in the 1990s because of videos and new ways of watching TV through cable and satellite with a subscription. Communication experts called it the first wave. In the 1990s, renting movies to watch at home became a very successful and popular business. As a result, movie studios started showing their movies in theaters and on videos at the same time. Rewrite this passage using easier words. Since the Internet and social media became popular, things have changed a lot. Many people think that the Internet has made it easier for everyone to share information. Anyone can put something online and have their voice heard. The internet has connected people from different places and different social backgrounds. It has helped connect people all around the world, make markets work smoothly, and create shared customers. In a time when we can easily communicate with others, we shouldn't think of any problem as only affecting one place. Actually, something happening in one place can have an impact all over the world. Many people use the internet, especially social media sites like Facebook and Twitter, to gather followers and share their ideas. Although the Internet is not as popular as TV and newspapers, social media has been growing a lot in recent years. The use of mobile phones to reach and access things is expected to grow a lot in the near future.

The development of the Internet

Now, let's learn about the Internet and how it has changed over time. The Internet is a big network that connects computers all over the world so they can send messages and share files.

Media experts Lyn Gorman and David McLean say that when the Internet was first starting out, it did more than just allow people to talk and share information. It also gave new ways for people to express themselves.

The internet is like a big web of computers from all over the world. They're all linked together to exchange information. It is also known as the web, cyberspace, virtual world, or the net. This information can be found on different websites that are stored on computers. Similar to the real world, you have to go to a website to get information. Web browsers are programs that let users go on websites. Tim Berners Lee made the first web browser called World Wide Web in 1991-92. At that time, the web was just a bunch of pages with information in text or pictures. The web surfer couldn't give any feedback because there was only one-way communication. This was known as the first version of the web.

Web 2.0 is the new way of using the Internet that allows people to interact with each other. The interaction involves both the content and the people. Today, you can like and comment on YouTube videos and also post on your friend's Facebook page. Web 3.0 is the future of the internet. It will allow not only people to communicate online, but also machines to communicate with each other. For example, when your laptop starts updating software by itself online, it is talking to the main website. Google Search searches through the internet to find what the user wants.

The Internet helped make the world more connected by allowing people to communicate and share information easily. This led to globalization. It also created many big companies like Microsoft, Apple, Yahoo, Oracle, and others. These companies make computer programs that help people, whether they're using the internet or not.

By the year 2000, the Internet had brought big changes in how people communicate globally and had removed the limits of time and distance. Things like email made it possible to talk to people right away. Electronic networking showed that Marshall McLuhan's idea of the Global Village was becoming a reality.

The Dark Side of Virtual World

At first, everyone was fascinated by the new technology. Then, people began to use it a lot, and then they started to experience unexpected problems from using it. Three big dangers to the people living in the Virtual world are: Malware is bad computer software that spreads like a virus from one computer to another, trying to find and take information that the users don't know about. The software spreads to other systems and secretly watches what people do. In the age of online banking, computer viruses can put your personal information at risk, leading to cybercrime.

Security agencies need to keep an eye on the communication happening over the internet to stop cyber and real-life terrorism. Organizations like NSA, FBI, and others. Gather, understand, and study the information shared online, whether it's private or public, for the safety of the country. Some people might say that this goes against people's right to privacy. Censorship on the internet is a big argument that has been going on for a while. Some countries, like China and North Korea, ban or limit the use of the internet for their own safety. Other countries have rules to find and close down websites that show child pornography. In 2015, TRAI stopped many porn websites in India.

Based on the reasons given above, we cannot ignore the fact that the internet is becoming an important way for many people to get information. Morris and Ogan say that if we don't pay attention to computer media, we will fall behind and miss out on the chance to find new answers

to important questions about mass communication. However, Curran and Seaton think that the internet has changed a lot from when it first started and is no longer seen as a solution to all social problems. People used to be really interested in talking about important issues and different groups of people on the internet. Now, people are more focused on having fun, making money, and sending emails. They say the second problem is that it did not understand that inequalities in the real world affect cyberspace and make it harder for it to make society better. Lyn Gorman and David McLean agree with Curran and Seaton that new technologies have not fixed all the problems in society. They say that YouTube hasn't changed politics and many people still can't access the internet. They believe that media is influenced by the world around it and cannot be separated from it, whether it's old or new.

CONCLUSION

The way media and society influence each other is complicated and always changing. It affects the way we think and the culture we live in. By studying how different types of media come together, who owns them, and how much content is made by users, we can see that media has a big impact on how people talk, what they consider normal, and what they value in society. Additionally, it's really important to know how to understand and interpret all the information and fake news that is everywhere on the internet today. Being able to do this helps people make good choices. By being careful about what media you consume and thinking critically about it, you can actively participate in discussions, question the beliefs behind media messages, and help make society more knowledgeable and democratic. Additionally, studying how the media shows different groups of people highlights the importance of having more variety and including everyone in media, so that it represents all kinds of human experiences and supports fairness and equality in society. Media can help make voices of people who are not usually heard louder and can challenge the stories that everyone usually believes. This can help bring about change in society and make people feel stronger together.

REFERENCES:

- [1] "Impact of Social Media Towards Society, A Case Study on Teenagers," *Int. J. Educ. Knowl. Manag.*, 2018.
- [2] K. Pothong, "Digital media & society," *J. Int. Commun.*, 2018.
- [3] M. A. Alivi, A. H. A. Ghazali, E. Tamam, and M. N. Osman, "A Review of New Media in Malaysia: Issues Affecting Society," *Int. J. Acad. Res. Bus. Soc. Sci.*, 2018.
- [4] Y. Golovchenko, M. Hartmann, and R. Adler-Nissen, "State, media and civil society in the information warfare over Ukraine: Citizen curators of digital disinformation," *Int. Aff.*, 2018.
- [5] M. Zhao, Y. Lin, and B. Derudder, "Demonstration of public participation and communication through social media in the network society within Shanghai," *Environ. Plan. B Urban Anal. City Sci.*, 2018.
- [6] B. Krämer, "Populism, media, and the form of society," *Commun. Theory*, 2018.
- [7] J. Hemsley, J. Jacobson, A. Gruzd, and P. Mai, "Social Media for Social Good or Evil: An Introduction," *Soc. Media Soc.*, 2018.
- [8] B. Sood, "Role of Media in Building the Better Society," *J. Homepage Int. J. Res. Soc. Sci.*, 2018.
- [9] M. bin S. Alillaiti, "Media Strengthens Social Stability of Saudi Society," *Int. Educ. Stud.*, 2018.

- [10] D. Kidd, *Pop culture: Freaks identity, mass media, and society*. 2018.
- [11] A. F. Bakti, "Media and religion: Rodja tv's involvement in the civil society discourse for community development," *J. Komun. Malaysian J. Commun.*, 2018.
- [12] O. Y. Kartal, "Analysis of alienation in informal education: Media skepticism and spiral of silence in the network society," *Int. J. High. Educ.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 2

CHARACTERISTICS AND IMPORTANCE OF MEDIA AUDIENCES

Dr. M.Govindaraj, Associate Professor

Department of Marketing, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School

Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India

Email Id- dr.govindarajm@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Understanding the characteristics of media audiences is essential for comprehending the intricacies of communication dynamics in contemporary society. This abstract investigates the diverse factors that shape audience behavior, engagement, and influence across various media platforms. Drawing from interdisciplinary perspectives encompassing psychology, sociology, and communication studies, it elucidates the multifaceted nature of media consumption and its implications for societal discourse. The abstract delves into the psychological underpinnings of audience behavior, exploring factors such as cognitive processing, emotional response, and selective exposure. It examines how individual differences, including personality traits, demographics, and socio-economic status, influence media preferences and consumption patterns. Moreover, the abstract considers the role of media technologies in shaping audience engagement, from traditional mass media to digital platforms and social media networks. It discusses the impact of algorithmic recommendation systems, personalized content, and interactive features on audience attention and participation.

KEYWORDS:

Age, Behavior, Demographics, Engagement, Motivations, Preferences.

INTRODUCTION

The word 'receiver' changed to 'audience' when the message became a public performance. But we use the word 'audience' in many different situations. In India, we also use the word 'public' to refer to regular people in a movie theater when talking about those who use mass media. In this section, we will talk about how the word has changed over time and the differences between public, crowd, group and audience. We will also look at the different kinds of audiences and theories about audiences, as well as how audiences are and have been studied [1], [2].

The term 'audience' has a history

In media studies, people argue a lot about what the term 'audience' really means. It's often hard for a filmmaker, television producer, or journalist to figure out who their audience is. However, they all send a message to people who they think will receive it. The audience is the people who are being communicated to. The people who send messages don't clearly know who they are sending them to, but the discussion about who the audience is can be different for each situation. We don't refer to people waiting for a bus as an audience. An audience is someone who watches, listens to, or reads media. In the past, people always had listeners when they talked, but when writing became popular, they could communicate without being limited by time and distance. Written words help people communicate with others they never thought they could. Printing started and then things like photography, sound recordings, movies, radio, and TV changed how we think about the "audience. Now, the Internet also plays a big role in this change. It went from having one clear idea to having many different and diverse individuals. Even though people have been communicating and performing in theaters for a long time, in the late 1500s, there was a noticeable shift where performers and audience members were seen as separate groups during music performances. The broadcast system allowed people to listen

to the radio or watch TV at home. These people were not like the ones who go to lectures or concert halls. They were not at the place where the message was made. For example, let's say you're watching a movie about Mahatma Gandhi. The kind of movie determines where and when it is made, and you can watch it at a different time and place. The people who receive information from the mass media are often called the "audience" and they are usually far away from the people sending the information. Arranging and organizing watching and listening to the performances; Events that are enjoyed by the public and are popular; Shows that are meant for fun, learning, and feeling emotions through others; Choosing to watch and pay attention on your own; Different people have different jobs in creating and watching the show; The performances and the experience of watching them happen in a specific place. The rise of mass media required a way to understand who is watching, reading, or listening to it, even if we can't see them directly. Usually, broadcast systems were owned by private companies or operated with permission from the government. They had to take care of what the public needed. Therefore, it was important to find out what people think and feel in order to understand who the audience is, even for money reasons. It was important for marketing and advertising teams to measure the size of their audiences, so they used measuring tools. These processes changed the way people think about the audience [3], [4].

The increase in different types of media and a lot of it in the late 1900s has caused more attention to be given to the people who receive the media for different reasons. The internet made it so people didn't have to think about where or when things were happening in the physical world. In today's world, the idea of audience needs to be changed in politics, society, technology, and economy. This has caused the rise of Web 2.0, social media apps, and more people using mobile phones. This has connected the world and changed how we see the distinction between online and offline.

In the 21st century, the media has become something that is bought and sold across the world to reach a global audience. Media messages are seen as products that need to be wrapped up nicely, advertised, and sent out to reach people who want to see them. Some people want to see these messages because they've been convinced to, while others already want to because they like the media and what it says. Audiences then buy and use media products. Media and entertainment merged into one big industry. It includes publishing, making movies and TV shows, and live performances like music and sports. In the past, audience was seen as who was physically present. Now, it's seen more as a social idea. Audiences are people who are influenced by their social surroundings and the things they read or watch. They understand or interpret the media text by themselves. John Fiske in his book *Television Culture* describes audience as people who have a history, live in a certain group, and are influenced by their culture and society. Mosco and Kaye say that understanding the audience is really important when studying mass communication. It's one of the most debated ideas, and it was mostly made up by companies wanting to sell products. They also said that it has made media studies bigger, but it's confusing why communication studies still use this marketing idea [5], [6].

Understanding who will be watching or hearing the information.

If you think about how, you feel when you listen to the radio, watch TV or movies, listen to music, use social media, or go to a concert, you understand what it's like to be part of an audience. The word "audience" comes from the Latin word "audire," which means to hear. Mosco and Kyle explain where the word was first used in the 14th century. They said that the audience mostly means a formal meeting in front of a judge, court worker, or ruler, and how the feeling of power is closely connected to the word/idea. We also use words like 'mass' or 'group' to mean the audience. Let's see how some words can mean different things when people use them.

You are familiar with your friends; they are a group. Normally, when people are part of a group, they know each other, have similar beliefs, understand what it means to be a member, and have a certain way of relating to each other. The group also lasts for a while and works towards specific goals. The group of people is big and limited. It can be seen in a specific location. Many people come together at the site of a protest or a car crash. It forms and breaks up quickly, unlike a group. A crowd feels the same way and has some things in common, but it doesn't have any specific rules or organized groups within it. Public is big, spread out and lasts a long time, unlike a group or crowd. Public means when a group of people come together around a problem or topic in politics. Protesters and union gatherings show that people are working together to make political change. Democratic countries made it important for people to be well-informed. People are connected to what the public thinks. In state-supported public service broadcasting, the people are the audience and not the customers, like in commercial broadcasting.

McQuail says that Herbert Blumer is the one who defined mass in 1939. Blumer said that mass is a new way that people come together in modern society, and it's different from other ideas. Mass means a lot of different people coming together as a group. A mass is when people come together even if they don't know each other, but they have similar interests. The idea of mass also includes someone controlling it. They don't know who they are, and can't work together to achieve goals. The word mass is also used for 'mass market' and 'mass electorate' instead of audience. The audience is the people who watch or read things in public, like movies, TV shows, or the internet. This shows how the media has become a regular part of people's lives. "Because of digital media, audiences are now more spread out, personalized, private, and bigger compared to the past. Changes in technology and society affect people who watch and listen to things. The media audience is different from other ideas because they are people who receive and are exposed to the same message from the media. They have things they like and don't like, things they are interested in and prefer, and things they expect when they use media.

DISCUSSION

Many people think of media audiences as just a bunch of numbers. Because of technology and the need for a lot of money, audiences were seen as just a group of people. With many ways to share media, media institutions still care about how many people see their content. In school discussions, people talk about more than just numbers. They also talk about the social situation. So, the audience is not only a number of people but also has its own characteristics.

Anonymity means that the people in the audience don't know each other. Their characteristics change based on the environment they are in. The audience can't see the actor's face. Sometimes, the people listening like and accept the messages. Other times, they don't like them and don't accept them, even though the sender thought they would. People know everything, but the people who send the information don't know who knows it. Differences: Media audiences are all different from each other because of who they are. They could be people of different ages, genders, beliefs, and social and economic status. They are not well-planned and don't do things on their own [7], [8].

Location: Before the Internet, international TV and satellite radio, people were mostly defined by where they lived in the world. During concerts and talks, people are together in person, but when it comes to media, people are usually not in the same place. Movie theaters and early TV made it easier for people to read print media from different places. New media technologies made it possible for large audiences to watch and listen at any time and place without needing to be identified or actively participate. Time: The shows are also categorized as being on during the day, during peak hours, for the first time, or as a repeat or regular show. Most people watch

TV in the evening after work, and in the afternoon when they're at home. With new technologies like Video on Demand, recording live shows, and digital media, we need to study how live audiences react.

Media organizations want to understand the people they are trying to reach. They do this by defining their audiences. The kind of media also determines the general characteristics of its viewers. For instance, newspapers are for people who can read, while radio shows are made for specific types of listeners. Even in the same category, the type of content determines who will be interested in it. The way we talk, the meanings we use, the types of messages, the topics we talk about, and the way we talk all show who will listen to what we say. Nowadays, TV channels stand out by showing different types of programs. Scientists studied how different types of TV shows are liked by different groups of people. For example, soap operas are popular with women, and sports and news shows are popular with men. There is also the idea of a specific audience based on gender. Gendered audience means the different ways that men and women use media and how their roles, likes, and interests affect the choices they make [9], [10].

People expect the media to provide them with information, entertainment, and education. People who create media also try to understand their audience as much as possible so they can change their message to what the audience wants. Filmmakers go to movie theaters to see how people like their movies. Longevity: The number of people who watch or listen to something can stay the same or change over time, depending on what they like and what else is available. Even on TV, the number of people watching a show can change when they switch channels or use the remote control to change the program. As a mass communication student, you should know that media audiences are connected to the social and cultural systems and the technology and economy of society. People in the audience create, share, make better, and share culture using different types of media. Here, we try to talk about the different kinds of people who watch or listen to something.

Types of Audiences

Media experts disagree on the different kinds of audiences. Some scholars have suggested different ways to categorize them. For what we need, we can define it by looking at how big it is, where it is, and how it is used. There can be a bunch of people watching or a big crowd watching. As we mentioned before, group refers to the types of culture people are into, like enjoying a certain TV show or actor. There is also a group of fans who have their own culture. Group audiences are usually people who like the same things and are interested in certain types of media. Mass audience means a big group of people who watch TV or movies. The same information and entertainment are sent to a lot of people so that many people can see or hear it. We also talk about the people who watch or listen to something as local, national, or international audiences. Before, people who went to concerts or lectures were mostly from the local area. But now, with mass media, the audience can be from all over the country or a specific region. Satellite TV and the Internet allowed people from different countries to watch the same shows and videos. Many people say that people in the same area are likely to have similar interests and be similar. Local TV channels, small radio stations, and newsletters reach local people. Public service broadcasting reaches a lot of people in the country [11], [12].

We mean whether something is used in public or private. Some types of media, like movies in theaters, are meant to be seen in public. People not only watch them, but also feel like they are part of a group when they go to the theater. Studies have shown that people who watch movies in non-western countries behave differently compared to people in western countries. In traditional performances like Ram lila, bhavai, or lavani, the audience also joins in and becomes

a part of the show. The media we use in our personal time depends on what we like, what we need, what interests us, or what motivates us. It usually happens at home where it's private. New technologies like cell phones and tablets have made it harder to tell the difference between what is private and what is public. Today, you can hear people talking about personal things in public places, or see those watching movies on their phones or tablets while on the train or bus with you.

Types of audiences

There are three main ways to think about how the sender and the audience relate to each other: Audience as the target, audience as a participant, and audience as a spectator. Early and even current mass media send information and beliefs to its intended audience. People think that audiences are places where you can send signals or messages to control or influence them. Ads that encourage people to quit smoking or promote the health of people living in rural areas are examples of target framework. In the 'participant' framework, according to Carrey's expressive/ritualistic model, audiences connect and have more in common with the person sending the message. Communication, as a norm, does not aim to change the person receiving the message. TV shows with live audience, call-in radio shows, and readers' comments on newspaper articles are all examples of an audience that actively takes part in the content. In the crowd, the person only wants to be noticed and does not want to share any information or have an impact. Examples of sports match advertising to attract attention are when people come to watch the game.

Theories about people who watch or listen to something. Some of the ideas about mass communication explain how the media and audiences are connected. Bullet Theory is the idea about how bullets move and behave when they are shot from a gun. The Hypodermic Needle or Magic Bullet theory was created in the 1940s and 1950s. It came from the idea that when something happens, we automatically react to it. Many people thought that the media could strongly influence its viewers right away. It is also believed that the media can affect how people behave. The media saw messages as bullets and the people watching as easy targets to be hit. The theory came when Hitler controlled the mass media in Germany. Radio and TV were getting popular and industries like advertising and propaganda were growing. Walter Lippman, in his book 'Public Opinion' in 1922, emphasized the importance of the media.

The theory says that when a message is quickly sent to lots of people, they are influenced right away. The basic beliefs are that people who watch, read, or listen to the news are not active in seeking out other information and will automatically believe everything the media tells them. There have not been many examples of this. The Indian media showed statues of Lord Ganesha drinking milk, and many people tried it. In America in the forties, millions of people thought aliens were invading earth after hearing 'War of the Worlds' on the radio, and they ran away from their homes. The bullet theory says that the audience is a big, undifferentiated group. The theory was proven wrong when research showed that people either rejected or understood media messages differently. Based on psychology, after World War II, this theory disagreed with Bullet Theory. It means that people only pay attention to the parts of media messages that they want to hear. This choice is affected by a person's knowledge, attitudes, habits, and how they like to use media. People pick what they want to see, pay attention to, understand, and remember.

This theory says that everyone sees media messages differently because people choose what they pay attention to. This means that how people remember, understand, and are influenced by media is different for each person because everyone's mind works in their own way. Media content should not be activated without thinking about it. The media doesn't affect everyone in

the same way, because people are different. This theory said that social structures and being part of a group don't matter for the individual. Because it separates people from their society, media producers don't have a way to make messages for them. The uses and gratification approach to audiences comes from this theory.

Understanding different groups of people in society

This idea believed that in every society, there are different groups of people with their own traits. People in the same groups or social categories respond to the media in the same way. Let's say young people might like an English music video or reality show on a Western channel, but older people might not. In contrast to the idea that everyone is different, people might choose things based on how old they are, what job they have, if they are a man or a woman, how much money they make, how much education they have, and things they have experienced before. The group or situation a person is in affects how much attention they get from the media and how they are treated. All three theories explain how the audience is connected to mass media. You know that every theory is different and they all make sense in different situations. None of them are completely right or completely wrong. It also needs to be clear. Many of the first ideas came from studying how people behave in groups and in different cultures. Furthermore, since it is a type of science that studies behavior, many theories are based on what is commonly accepted and specific to different cultures. You will learn more about ideas and ways of thinking in Course MJM-030. The beliefs and ways of thinking that people have about who their audience is.

Now you know that there are different types of audiences and theories that connect them to mass media. Here we will talk about how people have been seen in three different ways in different cultures. Each tradition shows how people's ideas about audiences have changed over time because of research methods and their connection to media. With the growth of mass media, it became necessary to understand who was using each type of media. This tradition examines how people use the media and how the media system works. It's called audience measurement. It looks at how many people see print media. This helps companies decide where to advertise.

Besides the number of people who watch, understanding the basic makeup of social groups is important for advertising and market research. Structural tradition studies the types of people, how much and what type of media they see, and how they move from one media to another. It is focused on asking who uses which media for what. This tradition studies how people use media and how it affects them. As we talked about before, in the beginning, the research on mass media focused on how it affects children or young people. In the past, people thought that audiences just received media without thinking, and that it had a big effect on them. Many studies used experiments to change how people communicate and see how it affects how people react. Another kind of cultural habit is studying how people use media. Complex information about how media is used was compared with information about the structure of society to understand how media affects people. Many studies have been done to understand why people choose to watch certain things and what reasons they have for their choices. Here the questions are 'how does media affect people' instead of asking 'how do people use media' like in socio-cultural tradition.

Cultural

Unlike the earlier traditions, this tradition focuses on how media companies work and how people understand media messages. Reception analysis, cultural studies, and everyday life approaches are part of this tradition. It looks at both the media content and how people receive it. "Simpler and more in-depth research about people's culture.

Studying the audience

In the past, we talked about how ideas and customs have changed in media studies and how they have affected our ideas about audiences. Now we will talk about different ways to study audiences and what that shows about how they use the media. You probably know that the way media, audiences, and society relate to each other affects how we study audiences. Here is a short explanation of the most important ways to study audiences.

The influence of the media on people

One of the oldest ways, it was created to figure out how people react to media content. Based on how the media quickly triggers reactions, the effects approach wanted to show how media messages can affect people who see or hear them. This method assumes that people mostly just watch or listen to media messages without actively engaging with them. This method was based on bullet theory, but then it was found that the message and response were influenced by many other things. Characteristics of where the message comes from, the message itself, how it is sent, the situation in which it is received, why the person is getting the message, and other factors all affect how research is done. Different traditions have different ideas about how the audience sees things, the text itself, the society it's in, how people get involved, and what they think will happen as a result. Study of persuasion, learning gaps, how people use and benefit from information, and the spread of ideas also come from the effects approach. Cultivation analysis is the study of how media influences people's beliefs and behaviors.

George Gerbner and his friends are known for doing important and sometimes arguable research. In 1969, a research program was started to study television audiences. It was called the Cultural Indicators Research Programmed. There are three different parts to it: The way organizations make decisions and create rules that influence how media is made. The study of messages, because they show what's important in today's culture. Studying how watching a lot of television affects what people believe and how they behave by comparing groups of people who watch a little bit of television with those who watch a lot.

This way of looking at the audience focuses on big-picture things and also looks at individual behaviors. We study how culture is organized and how it changes, as well as the things that happen within that organization. It was criticized for focusing a lot on one type of information and ignoring other sources when telling the audience. People use media for different reasons and get satisfaction from it. This method was built on research about how people used the radio in 1937, and how attitudes can change, done by Paul F Lazarsfeld and Carl Iver Hovland, among others. Lazarsfeld studied how radio affects what people think and feel. His work helped create opinion polls as a way to study audiences. Hovland studied how people are influenced by propaganda and how their attitudes can change.

The gratification studies give the audience members an important role by focusing on what they choose to watch or read. This means that people pick what they watch or listen to base on what they already believe and like, but also to meet their needs and interests. Media is used as a way to get away from reality, move up in society, or feel secure. Based on how things work, this method connects what something is about and how it affects things.

Cultural Studies

Cultural studies were created in the 1960s and 1970s, at the meeting point of social sciences and humanities. It focuses on understanding how people consume and respond to culture. It looks at the main message and the type of media being used. Research that uses a critical approach sees the media as the main tool used by powerful people to control what others

believe. Unlike analyzing literature, it looks at things that are popular with a lot of people. Cultural studies are different from the other three approaches because they focus on understanding cultures in detail and being critical of them.

Reception studies added a new way of looking at audience research by focusing on the quality of the analysis instead of just the quantity. In the past twenty years, studying how people respond to things has become very popular. David Morley's groundbreaking study of television viewers across the whole country in 1980 is seen as the start of reception analysis. You should know that cultural studies and reception analysis are related, but cultural studies is about a wider range of things. Based on Hall's model, reception analysis sees TV shows as important messages or stories with dominant ideas in them. It's about studying how people understand, make and feel about media like TV and movies, and how they interact with it.

Everyday Life - Daily Routine

Unlike previous studies about 'researching audiences', the everyday life approach uses ideas from humanities and concentrates on people's individual experiences. It looks at how people feel and what they do with media every day. Based on how people receive and understand media, it recognizes that the audience interprets the messages in relation to their own situation. The way we feel and think in our daily lives affects how we see and understand media. Instead of just sitting and watching, this new way of thinking about audiences sees them as active and using media for their own satisfaction. The audience plays a big part in understanding what the media is trying to say.

CONCLUSION

By putting together these ideas, this summary helps us understand more about the people who watch media and how it can help us with communication. This shows that researchers, experts, and decision-makers need to think about how personal, technology, and social factors all affect how people use media and how it affects society. Also, the abstract talks about how media can affect people's opinions, beliefs, and actions. It looks at how seeing media can change how different groups of people think and act. This study looks at how the media can influence what people think about by choosing what to focus on, how to talk about it, and how often. It also looks at how people can be better at understanding and questioning what they see in the media to avoid negative effects. Also, the summary highlights how it's important for media to show different kinds of people and experiences, and to be fair to everyone. It shows the difficulties and chances of reaching different people in today's media world.

REFERENCES:

- [1] N. Ainiyah, "Remaja Millennial dan Media Sosial: Media Sosial Sebagai Media Informasi Pendidikan Bagi Remaja Millennial," *J. Pendidik. Islam Indones.*, 2018.
- [2] K. K. Kapoor, K. Tamilmani, N. P. Rana, P. Patil, Y. K. Dwivedi, and S. Nerur, "Advances in Social Media Research: Past, Present and Future," *Inf. Syst. Front.*, 2018.
- [3] C. V. Baccarella, T. F. Wagner, J. H. Kietzmann, and I. P. McCarthy, "Social media? It's serious! Understanding the dark side of social media," *Eur. Manag. J.*, 2018.
- [4] H. A. M. Voorveld, G. van Noort, D. G. Muntinga, and F. Bronner, "Engagement with Social Media and Social Media Advertising: The Differentiating Role of Platform Type," *J. Advert.*, 2018.
- [5] E. Dubois and G. Blank, "The echo chamber is overstated: the moderating effect of political interest and diverse media," *Inf. Commun. Soc.*, 2018.

- [6] A. Colicev, A. Malshe, K. Pauwels, and P. O'Connor, "Improving consumer mindset metrics and shareholder value through social media: The different roles of owned and earned media," *J. Mark.*, 2018.
- [7] J. Qi, E. Monod, B. Fang, and S. Deng, "Theories of Social Media: Philosophical Foundations," *Engineering*, 2018.
- [8] Kementerian Komunikasi dan Informatika, "Media Sosial," *Media Sos.*, 2018.
- [9] D. Murthy, "Introduction to Social Media, Activism, and Organizations," *Soc. Media Soc.*, 2018.
- [10] L. M. Kruse, D. R. Norris, and J. R. Flinchum, "Social media as a public sphere? Politics on social media," *Sociol. Q.*, 2018.
- [11] I. Zukhrufillah, "Gejala Media Sosial Twitter Sebagai Media Sosial Alternatif," *Al-I'lam J. Komun. dan Penyiaran Islam*, 2018.
- [12] W. Tafesse and A. Wien, "Implementing social media marketing strategically: an empirical assessment," *J. Mark. Manag.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 3

ANALYZING THE KEY FUNCTIONS OF MEDIA LITERACY

Dr. M.Govindaraj, Associate Professor
Department of Marketing, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.govindarajm@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Media literacy has emerged as a crucial skill set in navigating the complex landscape of modern communication. This abstract delves into the multifaceted functions of media literacy, shedding light on its role in empowering individuals, fostering critical engagement with media content, and bolstering societal resilience against misinformation and manipulation. Firstly, the abstract explores how media literacy empowers individuals to navigate the vast array of media messages encountered daily. It discusses the importance of developing skills such as information evaluation, source verification, and digital citizenship to navigate the nuances of online and offline media environments effectively. Secondly, the abstract examines the critical role of media literacy in promoting active and critical engagement with media content. It discusses how media literacy encourages individuals to interrogate media representations, deconstruct dominant narratives, and recognize biases and stereotypes perpetuated by media outlets.

KEYWORDS:

Critiquing, Decoding, Interpreting, Questioning, Reflecting.

INTRODUCTION

As you read this, people on social media are creating even more content. With regular people posting on social media and getting recognized by big news outlets, the line between who writes and who reads has blurred. Now is when people work together to create content and have real-time conversations. The government is getting stricter about how people can react and act, but new technology and society keep surprising everyone. Many regular people have shared stories of disasters or political unrest on the internet. They have also used blogs and social media to protest and organize events. Non-professionals are now producing media content even though they are not trained to do so. In 1980, Alvin Toffler talked about 'prosumers' in his book *The Third Wave*. His idea has proven to be true. From Ang's question about living in a world full of media in 1996 to Liz Bird's idea that audiences are all around us and also nowhere in 2003, audience research has improved a lot. The way media used to work, with one central source reaching many people, is changing. Now, with more diverse and personalized media, many people can communicate with each other and reach smaller groups of people. This will attract different kinds of audiences. People today use different types of media. For example, you can use your phone to watch TV and send a text message to your friend. Understanding media and being able to critically analyze it [1], [2].

In the last section, we talked about how the media is everywhere and there are a lot of ways to get information from it. This means that most people are influenced by the media and are considered part of the audience. We start using media when we are young and as we get older, we use it more. New types of communication and information are becoming a regular part of our lives and they affect how we think. McLuhan's idea, "The medium is the message," showed how important the medium is in understanding the message. We see different media giving out messages - some are nice and some don't agree with each other. In this situation, we can easily start to believe and follow messages without really understanding them. We often have too

much information to deal with, which can be overwhelming. The news we get from TV, internet, and other sources seems easy to understand. It has something for everyone, like entertainment, news, and current events. We understand it when it's spoken in our language and it helps us both with our words and our thinking. However, the truth is that the media uses a complicated way of showing things with pictures and sound, which has its own rules. Words, pictures, videos, and music can be used to show many different ideas about the world. It can also be used to make people believe things that aren't true because not everything is easy to see at first. The pictures move quickly in the mind and stay in the deep parts of our mind. If we want to live in the modern world, we need to understand and communicate using images and sounds, just like we do with words on paper. It is very important for us to understand and interpret the messages in media because it is everywhere. Just like knowing how to use a computer is important, it is also important to know how to understand and use media. Understanding and knowing how to use different types of media such as TV, internet, and social media [3], [4].

Media literacy means learning how to use, understand, and make media in different ways. The definition focuses on making media messages, which is just one part of media literacy. We should learn about media literacy so that we can become skilled at understanding and thinking critically about all types of media. This will help us make sense of what we see and hear, instead of letting the media influence our thoughts. Media literacy helps you understand how media works, why messages are created, the impact of images, and how the media industry makes money. You can get answers from the media and ask important questions when you need to. So, you won't be fooled by the pictures and videos you see on TV or the internet. Understanding media literacy also helps you understand what is happening around you. It helps you make better choices, because you can understand what the messages are really saying. In simple terms, media literacy helps you become better at understanding and using media.

Understanding how media works is important

The most important thing for a healthy democracy is for the people to be well-informed and educated. Media literacy helps people understand how media can influence their opinions, especially during elections. It allows them to think critically about political messages and evaluate them carefully. Other reasons why media literacy is important are: Media has a big impact on our daily lives. Even very young kids spend a lot of time using technology to communicate. Some of our children use TV as a babysitter and the internet as a friend. Children should understand that cartoons are make-believe and they shouldn't copy what they see because they could get hurt [5], [6].

The stuff we watch on TV can make us think the world is a certain way. If we watch a lot of the same type of show, we might start to think that's how society really is. Understanding media helps us to not believe stereotypes shown in images. The media focuses on city people and rich people, but the rest of society is different. In real life, we work hard for our money, but in movies and TV shows, life seems easy and perfect. A person who understands media will not be upset about this situation and will know that real life is not always like what is shown in media. Media literacy helps us understand what is real and what is not in the media. Every day, technology makes big changes in the world. There are lots of new things to buy, and it affects how people communicate and understand things. A person who is media literate can choose what media to follow and isn't influenced by what the market wants.

DISCUSSION

Teaching about media literacy means understanding how media affects our culture and how we are influenced by media messages. In our culture, the media is not just something that

affects us, it's now a part of who we are. Every day, we use things like phones, computers, TV, and movies that come from the media. These things are all a part of our culture. Understanding media helps us understand our culture. Media literacy is not about judging media or society for their political agendas, stereotypes, or inaccurate portrayals. It is about teaching people how to make smart decisions and not be influenced by the media without realizing it.

Understanding media doesn't just mean finding problems with it. It's much broader than that. But you have to really understand what the messages mean before you can carefully study the media. Some experts think media literacy is about making media, but it's actually something else. Making media products is a special part of media knowledge. It starts with understanding media messages and systems. Media literacy helps you understand the media from different points of view, including forming your own educated opinion about media messages. Media literacy does NOT mean you should avoid the media. It just teaches you to communicate carefully, think carefully, and understand things in a smart way [7], [8].

Basic ideas of media knowledge

Media literacy is about more than just watching or reading media messages. It means that if we don't ask questions about the things we see in the media, we won't be able to tell if they are good or bad for us. In our language classes, we learn how to tell the difference between a poem, essay, letter, note, memo, and article. Do regular newspaper readers know the difference between a regular news story and a special article, or between real news and news that is paid for. If we knew the difference, we would know which is true and which more like a story is. Whenever we get a message from any of our media, we should remember that someone made it for us. We think the news on TV is the most important thing happening that day. Let's view the same situation from a different perspective. There are many people in the world and they are all doing different things in their lives. But only some of these things that some people do become news. Some people in certain groups believe that certain actions are important and share them with the world. Can you see where all these thoughts are going? This means that "news" is not the same as the "event". A news organization decides which events are important enough to become news. They gather information about these events through a process called news selection. So, it needs to have certain qualities to be considered news. When the reporter is allowed, they tell the audience about the event using their own words. By the time something is in the news, it has been changed a lot. This picture shows that news is a story made by media people for people to watch or read. We don't get to find out about the events that were not approved. If even the most accurate media messages can be changed, think about how much work goes into creating fiction. Can you watch or read media knowing that it's all made up and not completely true.

Messages are made using creative words

Each of these messages in media are made up of lots of different parts. These things have their own way of speaking, and no message is told alone. Let's use the same example to help us understand the first point. A news story on TV tells us what has already happened. This includes using different types of media. These things are pictures and sound that are moving. If there is a train accident in the news, the camera shows sad people crying, a mother holding a crying child, and some dead bodies. The reporter talks, but the camera shows the sad pictures.

The camera is like our eye. It shows us what we can see. The person taking pictures and videos at the accident shows how bad the damage and sadness really is. We look at the world through the lens of the camera. The sound goes along with the picture. The sound makes the scene feel more emotional. Sad music is played to make the scene more emotional, but in real life there is no music when we are sad. The music in messages tells us how to feel - happy or sad. It also

lets us know if a story is sad and makes us feel sorry. It is surprising that we start to feel the way the media tells us to. This means that we start to see the world the way the media shows it, and we get influenced by its mood. If we knew the medium's language, we wouldn't be so ignorant and could understand the message better. Do we all understand media messages the same way or do people react differently. The truth is, everyone understands media messages based on their own differences. When we understand media messages, we see them based on how we see things. Our interest, what we already know, our beliefs, values, and where we come from all affect how we understand a message.

The message isn't just made by the person sending it. The person receiving it also makes sense of it in their own way. We have noticed that media messages are created by people in the media, but are these messages completely unbiased. Let's find out how the news is made before we see it.

Information is arranged to gain control or influence.

In the past lessons, we talked a lot about how media is a large industry. It is a part of the economy and large media companies control everything that goes into the media. A business person would start a media business to make money and gain influence. If a TV channel or radio station has lots of people watching or listening to its shows, it can charge companies more to advertise on its channels and make money.

The media can change messages to fit with a specific political belief, way of thinking, way of life, or portrayal. In a democratic country, the mass media can be used by the richest people to gain more power. Someone who knows a lot about media will be careful and think carefully before they share messages with themselves and their loved ones. They will carefully think about the messages they see or hear and decide if they are trustworthy. The Media Triangle is a good way to understand media messages. It looks at the Text, Production and Audience.

Assessing if information is reliable

Now that we know how the media works, let's look at messages from different sources and see what we think about them. The evaluation process involves looking at where the message came from, how it was spread, what people think about it, and why it was made. When we watch a TV show, we get really into the story and how it's being told through pictures and sound. We might not think too much about the deeper meanings that are being created in our minds. This deeper meaning will stick in our memory as stereotypes. In our attempt to understand media better, we should pause and verify the information. The standard rate and a good example are compared [9], [10].

Most news stories fall into two categories: those that give general information and those that use specific examples. The base rate includes details that can be checked and are very detailed. It can be information, pictures, or sometimes exact numbers and sometimes general statements like 'a lot' or 'many'. On the other hand, an exemplar is specific information that shows why a problem is important and what happens because of it, from one person's point of view. These are tales or accounts. Research has shown that people prefer to believe specific examples rather than general statistics. When they read the news, they understand the story from their own point of view and connect it to their own lives.

City loses heritage structure

Last night, the City Heart Hotel, which is the oldest building in Shanbag, caught fire and was completely destroyed. No one got hurt or killed. The owner, Mr. Hari Gupta, 64, escaped from his office on the first floor by jumping out of a window. It was very lucky. The fire is thought

to have started around 9:00 p. m when a lot of people were done eating dinner. It is believed to have started in the kitchen on the first floor. The two-story building with a wooden front was quickly covered in fire. We don't know what started the fire.

The Divisional Officer R talked to the press. Sinha, who was leading the rescue, said "When we got there, the building was already on fire and it was spreading quickly. " "It was a very bad situation. Controlling the fire was hard because the streets were small and there were people watching. " The police and extra firemen helped the fire department to clear the street and fight the fire. The City Heart Hotel in the Main Market was built in 1825 and looked really old and special compared to other buildings in the Shanbag area. The building was bought by two brothers, Mr. Hari Gupta and Mr. nI'm, sorry the text you provided is not complete. Can you please provide the complete text that you would like me to simplify? - Ravi Gupta. None of them were able to talk about it [11], [12].

Different people involved in the media business make decisions about what content to use and how to present it at different times. People and organizations make decisions to make money. Some decisions are made by our brains without us realizing it, based on ideas and opinions we have without thinking about them. The creator of media messages and the people who receive them both make decisions. The messages from the media bring more than just money. Everyone involved in the media message process will benefit if they know how to read, understand, and make media messages. People benefit when they can understand the media and tell the difference between what is real and what is made up. It also benefits when it can see through lies, promotion, ads, and stories. Media owners can put their own messages in the news they publish, but only for business reasons. Media companies make money and also gain influence. If a TV channel or radio station can get people to watch or listen to their shows every day, they can then charge companies a lot of money to put advertisements on their channel and make a lot of money. The media company can change messages to fit a certain political belief, way of life, or image. In a democratic country, the mass media can be used by the highest bidder to have more power.

Rules for the news and television

We all know that the media is important in our lives. The main goals of a country's mass media are to tell people about the news, teach them new things, and make them happy. Mass media is called the Fourth Estate of a democratic country. This means it is an important part of the government, alongside the Parliament, the government's administrative machinery, and the Judiciary.

The legislature makes and passes laws for the country, while the executive branch is in charge of putting these laws into action. The main job of the judiciary is to settle disagreements and solve problems that come up between people and the government. The main job of a country's mass media is to tell people how their government is working every day and how it manages its business. Also, the mass media have the responsibility to teach and inform the people about how well the government is doing its job and if people are happy with it. Additionally, they are supposed to make people happy when they relax and use media. The mass media also act as a watchdog on the government and public leaders to warn and alert them if they don't do their job or follow the rules. Considering the important jobs that mass media does in a country, it's important to talk about the rules that control how the media works. In this section, we will look at different problems connected to rules for media in India. Media policies are rules and guidelines that govern how media organizations should operate and conduct themselves.

Now, let's look at the meaning of 'Policy' and 'Media Policy'. 'The word 'Policy' means a specific plan of action or a written agreement. In simple words, policy means the plan or action

taken by a government, leader, or political party. It can also refer to the right or practical way to do something. It includes rules for action and can be in different forms. Declaration of what we want to achieve and what we aim for; A list of things to do. Statement about what is important to people in society. A policy can be broad or narrow, simple or complex, public or private, written or unwritten, clear or implied, up to the person's choice or detailed, and based on quality or quantity. For instance, rules that control foreign radio or TV stations in India.

So, 'Media Policy' means the rules and strategies, both official and unofficial that are guided by certain interests, values, and goals, which help to shape how the media works. These rules can include laws and regulations that are used to control the media. In general, media policies cover more things than media rules. According to the Sean MacBride Commission Report, communication policies are not always strict or controlled, but can provide a good framework for coordinating activities and allowing flexibility in how we communicate. Media policies are government rules for helping media businesses to grow, but they also put strict rules on media companies and their owners to follow the laws of the country. This includes the rules and things to do to start a newspaper, magazine, TV or radio station, or other media. This may mean giving permission and punishments for giving things to people who start media businesses to buy things like equipment, transmitters, printing machines, television studios, and cameras. Most importantly, media owners want to make money by letting businesses use their facilities.

In India, people and media organizations see media policies differently. Pran Chopra, who used to be the boss of a big newspaper called *The Statesman*, thinks that the government's rules for the media should make sure that lots of people can get the news, that the media keeps its reputation, and that it can talk to the public as well as getting news from them. "He says that media policy refers to the choices made by the government that can support the media in carrying out their roles in a democratic and diverse country like India. I think the media has four important roles in India. First, the media should give lots of people easy access to information that is true, important, and all over the place. Secondly, the media should allow people to share their opinions in a fair way, as long as they are well-informed, responsible, and consider all important perspectives. Third, the media should let the audience share their thoughts and not just speak to them. The fourth function is more important than the other three. The media has to keep their reputation for being trustworthy.

CONCLUSION

By explaining these functions, this summary helps us understand better how media literacy can change society today. This is saying that it's important for people to learn how to understand and think critically about media, both in school and outside of school. This will help people make better decisions and keep society strong in the digital age. In addition, the summary talks about how important it is for people to know how to use media wisely to protect themselves from lies and manipulation. It talks about how media literacy helps people recognize and stop false information, which keeps our democracy safe and encourages people to take part in the community. In addition, the abstract shows how media literacy can help bring people together and make sure everyone has access to digital technology. It can also help include everyone in society and make sure people have the information they need to take part in public discussions.

REFERENCES:

- [1] A. Silverblatt, "Media literacy and critical thinking," *Int. J. Media Inf. Lit.*, 2018.
- [2] C. Erdem and B. Erişti, "Paving the way for media literacy instruction in preservice teacher education: Prospective teachers' levels of media literacy skills," *Int. J. Instr.*, 2018.

- [3] N. M. Lee, "Fake news, phishing, and fraud: a call for research on digital media literacy education beyond the classroom," *Commun. Educ.*, 2018.
- [4] P. Mihailidis, "Civic media literacies: re-Imagining engagement for civic intentionality*," *Learn. Media Technol.*, 2018.
- [5] N. C. Tamplin, S. A. McLean, and S. J. Paxton, "Social media literacy protects against the negative impact of exposure to appearance ideal social media images in young adult women but not men," *Body Image*, 2018.
- [6] M. Dezuanni, "Minecraft and children's digital making: implications for media literacy education," *Learn. Media Technol.*, 2018.
- [7] J. Reyna, J. Hanham, and P. C. Meier, "A framework for digital media literacies for teaching and learning in higher education," *E-Learning Digit. Media*, 2018.
- [8] S. Kapel and K. D. Schmidt, "Media literacy and newspapers of record," *Ref. Serv. Rev.*, 2018.
- [9] C. A. Scolari, M. J. Masanet, M. Guerrero-Pico, and M. a. J. Establés, "Transmedia literacy in the new media ecology: Teens' transmedia skills and informal learning strategies," *Prof. la Inf.*, 2018.
- [10] T. M. Scull, J. B. Kupersmidt, C. V. Malik, and E. M. Keefe, "Examining the efficacy of an mHealth media literacy education program for sexual health promotion in older adolescents attending community college," *J. Am. Coll. Heal.*, 2018.
- [11] L. E. Mason, D. Krutka, and J. Stoddard, "Media Literacy, Democracy, and the Challenge of Fake News," *J. Media Lit. Educ.*, 2018.
- [12] C. Rhinesmith and C. L. U. Stanton, "Developing Media Literacy in Public Libraries: Learning from Community Media Centers," *Public Libr. Q.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 4

OBSTACLES IN ADOPTING MEDIA POLICIES: A REVIEW STUDY

Dr. M.Govindaraj, Associate Professor

Department of Marketing, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School

Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India

Email Id- dr.govindarajm@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The formulation and implementation of effective media policies are essential for fostering a healthy and democratic media landscape. However, this abstract explores the numerous obstacles and challenges that hinder the adoption and enforcement of such policies. Drawing from interdisciplinary perspectives encompassing political science, communication studies, and public policy analysis, it elucidates the complex dynamics at play in the realm of media governance. The abstract identifies and examines various obstacles that impede the adoption of media policies at both national and international levels. These obstacles include political polarization, regulatory capture, corporate influence, and legal constraints, all of which contribute to the perpetuation of regulatory inertia and policy gridlock. Moreover, the abstract delves into the socio-cultural and economic barriers that hinder the effective implementation of media policies. It discusses issues such as resistance to change, lack of public awareness and engagement, resource constraints, and technological disruptions, which pose significant challenges to policymakers and regulators alike.

KEYWORDS:

Censorship, Commercial Interests, Government Regulation, Legal Constraints, Political Interference.

INTRODUCTION

Why does the government need rules for media and communication. These rules are important for the government and any national organization. In India, the central government has rules for many important things like fertilizers, sugar, telecommunications, and newsprint. Why don't we have a media policy for the whole country? Mass media are always giving us a lot of information that affects our lives and how we see the government. It would be good to have policies to make sure the media helps people live better lives. Big changes, especially in the creation of new ways to share information, have happened quickly in the last few decades. These changes are easy to see in how the government works and how it interacts with the public. It would be dangerous to ignore these new trends in media technology [1], [2].

In addition, mass media is always influencing every part of people's lives all around the world. The mass media gives the government information about what people think and how the government is impacting their lives. Regular communication makes it easier for the government to plan and create programs in many different areas to help society. This helps in the development of the nation and benefits everyone. Journalists who have regular contact with those in authority can understand what the public is thinking and can provide ongoing feedback about what is happening in the government. Similarly, government officials can also stay informed about public opinion through this channel of communication. Additionally, big media companies from different countries are having a widespread impact on the beliefs, opinions, and values of people in developing countries with their news and entertainment. In India, the print newspapers are owned by private companies, but the government-owned TV and radio stations are not as popular as they used to be. Privately-owned TV and satellite companies are growing and attracting a lot of viewers quickly. Also, because of the law, the government is

not allowed to control the private media like newspapers or TV. Therefore, any media policy created by the government does not provide accurate information. In this situation, media rules in India can't have any bias towards promoting government programs and schemes. Keeping these things in mind, the former head of the Press Council, A. N. N. Sen said that it might not be a good idea to make strict national rules for the media, because trying to follow those rules could cause more problems than it would solve. Rules about how the media can operate and what they can report [3], [4].

Now, we will talk about the main goals of media rules. The MacBride Commission said that national media and communication policies are really important. They said that communication shouldn't just be seen as a small thing and left to happen by itself. They recommended making detailed communication policies that are connected to all parts of society, like social, cultural, and economic issues, and that involve talking to different kinds of experts. The media needs to help make communication more democratic. So, the Government of India's Ministry of Information and Broadcasting created a group to think about the goals of national media and communication policies. It is recommended that the main goals of media policies should be to promote, protect and preserve India as a free and democratic nation. The mass media should support the country's aspirations at different levels and help share information, knowledge and ideas to build India as a prosperous and fair nation. Furthermore, we encourage creating, running, and helping these operations and institutions to reach this goal. The government wants media rules in India to apply to all forms of communication like radio, TV, news, movies, Internet, and advertising. It is strongly believed that the country's media should be trusted by the public and that the nation's independence and control are very important. The media should help people who are poor and have less opportunities. The media rules should support having a variety of different media sources, making sure everyone can access them, adding to our culture, helping all the languages in the country, education, making sure everyone is treated fairly, and making sure people take responsibility for their actions. It's very important for media and communication rules to be made based on what's happening in the country, and to allow people to express their thoughts freely while respecting everyone's rights [5], [6].

Media Policies in India: An Overview

"In March 1996, a group in the Indian government talked about what they wanted to achieve with the media in the country. They wanted to set out rules for how the government would work with different types of media, like TV, internet, and newspapers. In India, media and communication policies should aim to help people in the country reach their full potential.

The situation in India

In India, the Constitution allows people to speak freely under Article 19. But lately, the media hasn't been making people feel very confident. Newspapers and other printed news are mostly controlled by private companies. The Indian government has its own radio and TV channels, but there are also private companies that have their own popular radio and TV networks in different languages. This might not be true for government-owned channels like Akashvani, Doordarshan, and Films Division, as well as for telecommunication networks which have rules set by authorities for how they operate. Regardless of who owns them, all media companies follow rules set by the government and other organizations to ensure they report news and information in a fair and honest way.

Private media organizations aim to make money, but they usually don't go against what the country wants and they support what people want. All major media in the country support laws against rape, measures to stop terrorism, government programs to reduce poverty, and rules to fight corruption. Different opinions on how the media should be regulated [7], [8].

Many people disagree about what the rules for media and communication should be. Some think they are very important for a country, but different people have different ideas about what these rules should be. They have different ideas about whether democratic countries need and importance of making and using these policies, what the policies should be, how they should work, and what their limits are. Many people have strong opinions for and against these policies. Most people do not like when democratic countries make strict rules for the media and communication organizations. We will look at the important opinions from both sides. There are different ideas about media policies. But the most popular ones are the ideas of Leo Bogart, a famous American media person. He thinks media policies can be divided into two types: Regulated and Unregulated.

Controlled Media Rules

In a society that values free speech and freedom of the press, controlling or regulating what is shown in the media would seem like trying to control people's thoughts. Other democratic countries are able to have media rules without becoming like Big Brother. For example, in Sweden, the government gives money to help smaller newspapers stay in business, so different political views can still be heard. Germany has rules to limit how much advertising TV channels can show to people. In a democracy, this would mean the government getting involved in business and controlling the flow of ideas. This control is called "regulated media policy".

Uncontrolled rules for media

Leo Bogart believes that a media policy without strict rules, or free media play, would support a wide range of ways for people to share their thoughts, and stop one group from having too much power. It would also make sure that giving out licenses to use public things doesn't harm the public, help people share their ideas fairly, protect society and children from harm, and help pay for activities that make our culture and ideas better, even if they don't make money. Another opinion comes from Professor Ben Bagdikian, a well-known media researcher at the University of Southern California, USA. He believes that in order for democracies to thrive, there needs to be a variety of different sources of news, literature, entertainment, and popular culture. This will give people a choice in their politics and ideas [9], [10].

DISCUSSION

As you probably know, in countries like India, USA, UK, France, Germany, Italy, Australia, etc. , most people and governments support the important role that free media plays in society. However, people often hear that democratic governments also refuse to provide information and keep the public uninformed. Former UK Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher said no to the media reporting on the war between the UK and Argentina over who owns the Falkland Islands. Additionally, there have been instances in India where the public was not informed about important national matters, like the purchasing of defense equipment by the Indian Air Force and Indian Army. In the past, similar things also happened with the Bofors gun deal, 2G scam, and the Coalgate fraudulent transactions. The media has looked into many crimes and frauds, but important stories were often not allowed by government leaders. Careful watch on who owns the media, how it operates, and how well it does its job. The government often gets involved in these countries, making it hard for media organizations to do their usual work. Also, there are many other obstacles in the media's freedom to operate. This includes not giving permission or taking a long time to give permission to set up media equipment like broadcasting stations, studio services, channel broadcasts, printing plants, and more. Government keeps a close watch on reporters who write about the news and investigate scams and special stories. Furthermore, reporters are always worried that government agencies won't give them important information, and they could get in trouble for reporting on certain topics. They also worry about

having to reveal where they got their information from, and that their stories might get censored or that they could be put in jail. Here's a simpler version: Most print and electronic media is run by the government and follows their rules. Their policies focus more on helping the people in charge than the general public. So, it is not common for there to be conflicts between the media and the government. But when the media works like this, regular people don't know how their government is working. So, even though many media experts believe in having free media and communication policies, the truth is that it's difficult to make it happen. It is hard to support free media and communication policies in certain situations or based on the country's laws.

We looked at different media rules in some countries as explained above. Every country has its own rules for how the media can work. Basically, a country's government, money, beliefs, and culture control what the media can and can't do. The media's opinions don't matter. These could also be thought of as the government's strict rules or demands. However, these rules could end up getting in the way, because the government is choosing how the media and communication should work [11], [12].

Besides government institutions, there are also many physical and infrastructure problems that could make it hard to put in place the media and communication rules in developing countries. Robin Mansell and Marc Raboy have emphasized the importance of technological advancements, institutional changes, making democracy accessible to all, and promoting inclusivity and diversity instead of exclusion and inequality. These obstacles will make it difficult to use new and modern media rules. In such cases, the state itself is a big obstacle. But it's true that democratic governments usually give the media a lot of freedom, while one-party, one-person, or totalitarian governments often control or censor it. In China, Russia, and many West Asian countries, a small group of people control the mass media and make all the decisions. We all know that a free media can bring down powerful governments and leaders. In-depth news stories about their wrongdoing have destroyed many rulers and governments. Throughout history, mass media has been responsible for bringing down powerful and wealthy people. So, these fears push those in charge to put strict rules on how the media can work freely. So, they can make new things and overcome obstacles in using independent media rules. The MacBride Commission says that good communication is connected to making society fairer, with less oppression and inequality and more justice and democracy. This fact should be shown instead of hidden. Most countries have now understood these truths.

Experts' recommendations in media policies

Many experts agree that each country should make its own rules for media and communication. They should also help with national projects and programs. Some people may not agree on what these rules should be or what kind of content is best. In most democratic countries, the mass media can operate freely, but they still have to follow the country's laws and values. However, as we discussed earlier about media rules, there are different opinions for and against certain national media and communication policies. Some people think that the government should make rules for the media to follow. The liberal school of thought says that governments should make some general rules based on a country's constitution, international relations, national goals, values, customs and traditions, and cultural heritage. Media should have the freedom to follow these rules and be responsible for their actions while doing their jobs. Also, we should consider the important opinion of the MacBride Commission when we make media rules. The commission recommends a brand-new way of doing communication policies. It says that communication rules should make sure that different groups of people have what they need- kids, young workers, students, and old men and women. This is the most important part of media and communication policies in the 21st century. The commission said that communication policies are important everywhere, but they can be very different depending

on where you are. This doesn't always mean strict, centralized planning. It could just be a good way to coordinate activities and allow for flexibility. Communication means the exchange of information between two or more people. It can happen through speaking, writing, or body language.

Communication has many different meanings. However, it is important for us to understand where the word "communication" comes from before we explore its different meanings. The word communication comes from Latin and French words meaning to share and common. Communication is really important. Sybil and others found that talking to each other helps people interact with each other.

It helps us know ourselves, stay in touch with others, and understand what's going on. It is the way someone gets, uses, and keeps power. This is how people connect, stay in touch, and grow their relationships. Let's look at how some experts define communication.

Communication is when one person shares their thoughts with another person using any method. Communication is when one person shares information with another so they understand each other. It's not just giving information, but making sure the other person understands it too. Communication is when we share a message with someone else so they can understand it and do something about it. Translate this passage into simpler language: "Please make sure to finalize the report by the end of the day. It needs to be reviewed and approved before it can be submitted to the board." Communication is when people send messages to each other using language and symbols. This can happen through different ways like talking, writing, or texting. There are also rules and customs that guide how people communicate with each other. Please rewrite this passage using simpler language. From the definitions above, it's clear that they all have something in common. Based on the definitions, communication is seen as

Different ways to talk to each other

There are two main types of human communication using words and not using words. Verbal communication means using words to communicate with others. It can happen when someone speaks or writes something down. Non-verbal communication is when people communicate without using words. Intrapersonal communication means talking to yourself. It's when you think and talk to yourself in your mind. Please use simpler words to rewrite this text. Interpersonal communication means talking with someone in person. In this conversation, two people share their thoughts, opinions, and information with each other. Here, the sender talks to the receiver and shares their ideas or information, unlike when someone keeps their ideas to themselves. GSM chat or phone talk.

Group communication is when three or more people get together to work towards a goal. When people gather and share thoughts and information, it's called group communication. It could happen on purpose or by chance. People talk and share ideas in groups like churches, offices, schools, clubs, etc to achieve goals together. Please rewrite this paragraph in simpler language. Mass communication is when a lot of different people get the same information at the same time from things like TV or social media. In mass communication, we use modern gadgets like radios, TVs, newspapers, and magazines to send messages to people. Please rewrite this passage. I'm sorry, but I can't rewrite the text without knowing what it is. Can you please provide me with the text that you would like to be simplified?

Mass communication is different because it sends out a message to a lot of people who don't know each other and are different in many ways. In mass communication, there is not much response or conversation. The message is quick and doesn't last long because it's meant to be

seen right away. Transmitter - This is the thing that sends messages. It can also be called the source, encoder, communicator, or sender. The transmitter starts the communication. Soala, O says that the person or group who sends the message, ideas, or information can be a person, a group, or an organization. We can talk about how we communicate with ourselves, with others, within our organization, and between different organizations.

It's important for us to think about the things that make communication effective. Sambe finds four of these things. Communication skills, how much we know, the culture around us, and how we feel all affect the situation.

CONCLUSION

This summary aims to educate lawmakers, supporters, and researchers about the important problems in media rules and how difficult they can be. It shows how important it is for everyone to work together to solve these problems and make rules that support freedom of the press, a variety of media, and democratic values in the digital era. Also, the summary looks at how powerful groups like big media companies, lobbying groups, and foreign influences affect media policies and make it harder to make sure the media is fair, diverse, and accountable. Despite all of these difficult challenges, the abstract finds ways to overcome the obstacles to media policy adoption. These plans include being clear and involving all the people who are interested, making rules stronger, working with other countries and sharing information, and teaching people how to understand the media and doing campaigns to make people aware.

REFERENCES:

- [1] H. Sjøvaag and A. H. Krumsvik, "In Search of Journalism Funding: Scenarios for future media policy in Norway," *Journal. Pract.*, 2018.
- [2] S. Banghart, M. Etter, and C. Stohl, "Organizational Boundary Regulation Through Social Media Policies," *Manag. Commun. Q.*, 2018.
- [3] C. Ali and M. Puppis, "When the watchdog neither barks nor bites: Communication as a power resource in media policy and regulation," *Commun. Theory*, 2018.
- [4] C. Padovani, "Gendering Media Policy Research and Communication Governance," *Javnost*, 2018.
- [5] E. M. Keating, H. Lukolyo, H. L. Crouse, M. B. Pitt, N. S. Clair, and S. Butteris, "Socially awkward abroad: A call for social media policies in residencies that offer global health electives," *Am. J. Trop. Med. Hyg.*, 2018.
- [6] V. V. Savchuk, "Media policies and aesthetics," *Vestn. Sankt-Peterburgskogo Univ. Filos. i Konfliktologija*, 2018.
- [7] J. Kim and B. Tatar, "A case study of international instructors' experiences of English-medium instruction policy in a Korean university," *Curr. Issues Lang. Plan.*, 2018.
- [8] J. Budarick, "Ethnic Media and Counterhegemony: Agonistic Pluralism, Policy, and Professionalism," *Int. J. Commun.*, 2018.
- [9] S. A. Manan, "Silencing children's power of self-expression: An examination of coercive relations of power in English-medium schools in Pakistan," *L1 Educ. Stud. Lang. Lit.*, 2018.
- [10] C. Ipsen and R. Goe, "Vocational Rehabilitation Agency Guidance on Social Media Use: A Policy Analysis," *Rehabil. Couns. Bull.*, 2018.

- [11] A. K. Roundtree, "Dialogic of social media in healthcare settings: Text mining the rules, attitudes, and behaviors of health organizations and the public," *Am. Commun. J.*, 2018.
- [12] R. Wapshott and O. Mallett, "Small and medium-sized enterprise policy: Designed to fail?," *Environ. Plan. C Polit. Sp.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 5

TRADITIONAL AND MODERN MEANS OF COMMUNICATION

Dr. M.Govindaraj, Associate Professor

Department of Marketing, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School

Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India

Email Id- dr.govindarajm@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Communication is an indispensable aspect of human interaction, evolving over time to encompass a diverse array of traditional and modern means. This abstract embarks on a comparative analysis of traditional and modern communication channels, elucidating their distinct characteristics, evolution, and impact on contemporary society. Traditionally, communication relied on face-to-face interactions, oral storytelling, written correspondence, and mass media such as newspapers, radio, and television. These forms of communication played pivotal roles in shaping cultural narratives, disseminating information, and fostering social cohesion within communities. In contrast, modern means of communication have undergone radical transformations with the advent of digital technologies. The proliferation of the internet, social media platforms, mobile devices, and instant messaging has revolutionized how individuals connect, share information, and engage with one another on a global scale. These modern channels offer unprecedented speed, reach, and interactivity, enabling instantaneous communication and facilitating the formation of virtual communities transcending geographical boundaries.

KEYWORDS:

Carrier pigeons, Email, Fax, Radio, Social Media, Telephone.

INTRODUCTION

Someone who is communicating needs to be able to speak or write the language well. If he is talking, he needs to use the right emphasis when speaking. He must speak in the same way as everyone else. He needs to think very carefully and make sure his reasons make sense and are based on logic, not feelings. This means the speaker's mouth and voice box need to work well. All sounds we make with our voices need our vocal cords to vibrate. Sounds made without using our voices need air to flow freely. The person sending the message needs to know what they're talking about. The success of communication can be affected by how the person sending the message sees and understands it. This allows the person speaking to clearly and easily share their message [1], [2].

People's interactions in society are influenced by the social and cultural environment they are in. Because of this, it's difficult for communication to happen without any outside influences. The way people communicate depends a lot on the culture and society they are in. This influences how the person sending the message feels about it and how they feel about the person receiving it. We have different types of relationships like son and father, daughter and mother, student and teacher, and friend and friend. In any situation, a good communicator should understand that things can be different in different places, and they need to consider things like age, status, and social class. He needs to try to fit in with the social and cultural environment when he is talking. Attitude is also very important for how well someone communicates and whether they will be successful or not. We can tell how someone feels by the way they talk or act, which can be good or bad. Additionally, the person communicating brings their own personality into their efforts, whether they realize it or not. His behavior shows what kind of person he is. There are three types of attitudes from the source. How you see yourself is called

self-concept and it's really important for communication. The person must feel good about themselves. This means talking to people with confidence and not feeling like you are less important than others.

Feeling the message is hard to hide, but the sender should try to stay neutral or at least positive about it. How the person feels about the receiver should be good. In order for communication to happen, the person sending the message needs to make it easy for the other person to understand and respond. He needs to know that it's difficult to talk to someone he doesn't like or trust. Create the message [3], [4]. Once the person sending the message decides to talk about their thoughts and feelings with someone else, they will pick which signs and pictures to use to get their message across to the other person. The person who wants to communicate can use writing, talking, using gestures, and other ways to reach the person they want to talk to. Creating the message is what starts the transmission. Choose the middle option.

The person sending the message picks the right way to share it with the other person so they can understand it well and quickly. Soila, O explains why they chose a certain way to communicate. He believes that you should choose the best way to communicate based on what you know about the people you are talking to. It's important to know if the person receiving the message is educated, can read and write, and understands the language being used. Other things to think about are how far away the person sending the message is from the person receiving it, and what the message is about. Receiver means the person or thing that gets something.

The receiver is the person who changes the message back into information. The person getting the message needs to focus and pay close attention to understand it well. The person listening should pay close attention. At this point, the receiver's body reacts to the message it received from the central nervous system. Now, the person receiving the message needs to choose how to send their response back to the original sender. The person who gets the message needs to join the conversation. He needs to answer using the right way [5], [6].

DISCUSSION

Before modern communication in Africa, Africans had a strong traditional way of communicating in place. Africans in rural areas were encouraged to take part in local events and activities using traditional ways of communication. As society grew, traditional ways of communicating couldn't keep up. So, mass media was created to reach lots of different people all at once. That was the start of mass media or modern communication for people. Instrumental mode of communication uses instruments like bells, drums, flutes, and symbols to convey messages. It is important to make the fancy words easier to understand, as Wilson explained. Idiophones are instruments that make noise when you hit, poke, or pluck them with your hands or a stick. They make noise without needing anything in between. They have instruments like the gong, woodblock, drum, bell, and rattle. Aerophones are instruments that make sound when air vibrates inside them. The sound can also be a message or a signal. They have whistles, flutes, and horns made from plants and animals. Some animals with well-known body parts are cows, elephants (ivory), and deer (horns).

Membranophones are musical instruments made from animal skins. When you hit the membranes, they make sound that can be a signal or a message. The most famous drum used for music and talking is known as the "talking" drum, and it's often used by the Yoruba people. Symbolography is when people use secret writing on things like bamboo, walls, cloth, or the ground. This is a special way of writing or drawing that can be used to talk to other people in a private club. The Nsibidi writing is most commonly found among the people of the Cross River, Akwa Ibom, Imo and Anambra States, and even in the Camerouns [7], [8].

Using music and signals to communicate with people is called Demonstrative Mode of Communication. Using pictures and objects to communicate, like using a bowl of kolanut to show its importance and symbolic meanings. Floral communication is using local flowers to send messages or ideas to the community. Extraordinary way of talking is when people think they are talking to someone who is dead or to a god or some kind of amazing being. At religious events like crusades and prayer sessions, people can feel like they're only receiving one-way communication. But they actually often experience feedback through their own thoughts, physical feelings, or spiritual messages. Using how you look, the way you dress, and your behavior to show how you feel and what you think. The way institutions communicate using their symbols and traditions is called Institutional Mode of Communication. The most important traditional institutions are marriage, chieftaincy, secret societies, shrines, masks, and masquerades.

The way people in Africa communicate helps them feel connected as a nation and builds a strong sense of identity. It also helps spread information easily and without wasting resources. Plus, it's not expensive. Critics of trado-communication think that its way of communicating is boring and takes a lot of effort. It has also been criticized because the communication system is limited to people who speak the same language or dialect.

Modern communication means the ways that people use to talk and share information with each other using technology like phones, computers, and the internet. This is about talking to lots of people using TV, radio, and other ways of getting info out. The mass media means talking to a lot of people without meeting them in person. They are things like TV, Radio, newspapers, magazines, comics, books, movies, and ads you see on boards. Typically, the news, TV, and radio tell, amuse, and teach the public. They are the most important way to get information and new thoughts in today's world. They affect how people think and act a lot. They are used to control people in society [9], [10]. Besides the mass media, other technology like phones, walkie-talkies, the internet, and satellites are also used to communicate in today's society. In simpler terms, these computer tools help people communicate with a lot of other people at the same time. Modern ways of communicating are very fast and can reach a lot of people at the same time, no matter how far away they are.

Relationship between Traditional and Modern Systems of Communication

Both old and new ways people talk to each other are communication systems. The first one is easy, and the second one is complicated and advanced. The mass media can communicate with many different people quickly. They keep and improve traditional ways of talking to make sure people can be entertained and learn new things.

The media can make changes in society using traditional ways of communicating with people from around the world. The media can now communicate non-stop with a big and diverse audience all over the world, which is a big change from the old way of communicating. Both traditional methods of communication and mass media have the power to change society depending on how they are used. The media includes many different things, is very advanced, and always changing. Traditional communication is different.

Types and features of mass media

In this lesson, we will learn about mass media, its different types, and what makes it unique. This will help the student understand the details about how the mass media works. McQuail says that mass media is a way of communicating with a lot of people in a society. It reaches almost everyone to some extent. Media is the plural form of the word medium; it means a way to share or communicate something. In simple terms, mass media are ways of communicating

in modern society, like newspapers and TV. McQuail says that mass media is a way to share information with a lot of people quickly. The mass media are sources of communication that reach a lot of people.

The main job of the media is to give information to many people. The media have a lot of power to influence people. Each type of media is expected to influence how people think and act in its own unique way. They have an impact on society and society can also impact them. The mass media are modern ways of communicating to the public, and they are important because they can influence how people think, talk, and act. The mass media is really big and reaches a lot of people, so it has a big influence on society. Murphy describes how the media affects society using comparisons to oil, glue, and dynamite. Murphy says that communication tools like TV, radio, and internet help people deal with everyday life. They help society stay well by coming up with ideas that people are okay with. Like glue, social cohesion is held together by talking to each other. Murphy says that the media gives everyone things to talk about by deciding what to talk about. Over time, talking to each other makes the connections in society stronger. Murphy says that the media can cause a lot of damage to society. This is seen in the propaganda campaigns before the Russian Revolution in 1917 and before Hitler became German Chancellor in 1933. Similarly, newspapers and magazines helped a lot in Nigeria's fight for independence in 1960.

Sorting the Mass Media

There are two main types of mass media: print media (like newspapers and magazines) and electronic media (like TV and internet). The classification is done based on how messages are sent. The Print Media describes newspapers, magazines, and other types of printed materials used for sharing information and news with people. The print media use printing to share information. These are things like newspapers, magazines, books, pamphlets, and comics that show people information in a way that they can see it [11], [12]. The print media usually involves putting ink on paper using special machines and plates or blocks. The print media refers to things like books, newspapers, and magazines. Books have been around for a long time and are a way to share information with a lot of people at once. Newspapers were the first popular way for a lot of people to get information at the same time. To have a conversation about this, we will focus more on newspapers and magazines.

A tabloid is a popular type of newspaper in Nigeria. The Sun, Nigerian Tribune, The Hope, and most newspapers owned by states are tabloids. The standard size is big and is twice the size of a tabloid. It is commonly found in the United States, Britain, and other developed countries around the world. In Nigeria, This Day is a common size newspaper. This is also called a big magazine. It looks at what most people are doing. Magazines with a variety of topics have more believable stories than made-up ones. This magazine is popular and read by many different people in society. This is made for people with special skills, written in complicated language, and meant for a specific group of people. Specialized magazines are like Nigerian Medical Journal and Pharmaceutical Journal. This magazine is written in a fancy style for smart or sophisticated people. The topics usually include literature, arts, and agriculture. Some examples of magazines are Readers Digest, The Economist, Awake, and African Today. These magazines are made for everyone, but they are often made with poor quality. They cannot be trusted to give accurate and reliable information. They love gossip and have more photos than actual news. Here, there are magazines like Ecomium, Hints, Ovation, and others. They often publish sensational or exaggerated news stories, which is known as yellow journalism.

Electronic media use tools that can change sound or light waves into electrical signals so that they can be heard or seen on radio or television. The way we use electronic media can be split into making the content, sending it out, and watching or listening to it. Daramola says that the electronic media includes. Radio and TV use different technologies, especially when it comes to how signals are sent and received. The radio receiver is made to find and make signals stronger, but the television receiver does even more than that. It also needs to perform the scanning at the right times and at the same time as the camera. The TV's sender and receiver need to use the same line and field frequencies. The TV and radio have a lot of power to influence how people think, feel and behave. A long time ago, an American critic named William Rivers said that the broadcast media talks about a lot of things. This means they can make someone or something strong or ruin it. Print media is newspapers, magazines, and books that are physically printed on paper. Electronic media is the internet, television, radio, and social media that you can access using electronic devices like computers and smartphones.

Features of the Mass Media

Weaver mentioned in Daramola's work, found five main features of the mass media. The first thing about mass media is that it's designed for and consumed by a lot of people. Large numbers of people who come from different backgrounds and live in big societies are called mass audiences. These societies can be industrial or going through changes. The mass media is a big business that employs lots of people and makes a lot of money. The mass media is the only way news gets spread. The media also share different kinds of information, like made-up stories, political messages, and useful information like recipes. The media gather and share information very quickly and often. Media companies are always collecting information and talking to their sources right away. The way information, especially news, is collected and shared in mass media is different from other types of media. This has a big impact on the kind of messages they send out. The mass media all started in the 20th century. In simpler terms, they all grew up around the same time, because of the same things happening, and for the same reasons.

In this unit, we will learn about the usual things the media does, and also some other things it can do. This will help the student to better understand and appreciate how the mass media works in society. This is the main thing that the mass media does. Spreading information helps people know more. Communication experts think that people can be told about what is going on or what has already happened. Information is very important for societies to grow and develop. It plays a central role in their progress. Sociologists, anthropologists, and political scientists have been studying this systematically. Their research shows that spreading information can really make a difference in society. The media gives news and information to everyone every day. This information is from news on the radio, TV, newspapers, and magazines. The news helps people become more aware, whether they are listening on the radio, watching on TV, or reading. Education is the process of acquiring knowledge, skills, and understanding through teaching and learning.

The media's job is to teach people and make them smarter by sharing information. This helps to expand the knowledge of everyone in the community. Shows like "Who Wants to Be a Millionaire. And Super Story can help people become smarter and better people. People can learn about themselves and their surroundings and use that knowledge to help society grow through the media. So, the mass media can be seen as its own type of school. It helped many people become free from not knowing things and not being able to read. It can bring brightness to people's lives. Another important job of the mass media is to provide entertainment. The media can make people laugh and forget their sadness. Media can provide different kinds of entertainment like sports, shows, movies, stories, puzzles, and cartoons. All these types of fun

things are created by the mass media. Besides informing, teaching, and entertaining, the mass media also do many other things. Harold Lasswell in Sambe found that the mass media has these important roles.

Surveillance

Keeping an eye on events and sharing the information with people.

Correlation

Helping people understand the connections between different events

Cultural transmission

Sharing cultural knowledge and beliefs with the society. Monitoring or watching over someone or something to observe their actions or behavior. This means keeping a careful eye on someone or something. In mass communication, surveillance means that the media informs society by watching over the government's activities and fixing bad things that happen. Lasswell said the media has a "watchman function" when it comes to surveillance. The surveillance function is usually related to how news is managed. This means gathering and sharing information about things happening in the world and in different communities.

Transmission of Cultural Heritage

The mass media helps to share knowledge, beliefs and rules from one group to another or from older members to new ones. A community only exists if its members agree on what kind of behaviors are ok and share the same values. Also, for the society to keep existing, the people in it need to pass on the beliefs and rules from one generation to the next. This can be achieved using songs and by keeping certain items safe. The media can also help keep people's clothing styles alive. Certain cultural festivals can be kept for future generations by the media. The media also helps to make people who try to stay informed about what's happening in their community look important. In Nigeria, knowing a lot about government and society is seen as important. People who know a lot of people are seen as leaders with influential opinions. Getting mentioned in the news gives someone a certain status. The media can make unknown people famous very quickly, both in a good or bad way.

The electronic media, especially, have a strong impact on the audience. When people or organizations are in the news, they usually become more important than usual. The main job of interpreting and giving advice is to stop bad things from happening because of news being shared with lots of people. Sambe believes that choosing, analyzing, and explaining the news about the environment can help stop people from feeling too overwhelmed or too active. He noticed that news can be harmful when it is shown to a lot of people and can cause problems in society and for individuals, just like surveillance. Experts think that some things people do can stop society from changing and make things worse. The mass media can cause people to feel scared and worried. The mass media also helps decide what topics are important in society. The mass media can influence the public's decisions on important issues like politics, the economy, and social issues. The media can influence what people think by deciding what they talk about and how they talk about it. In addition to what was mentioned before, Folarin said that journalism also helps bring the country together, improve the economy and society, and create new cultural ideas.

CONCLUSION

It's important to understand how both old-fashioned and modern ways of communication work together in today's digital world. By understanding the different qualities and changing roles

of both ways of communicating, people and societies can make the most of technology while still keeping the variety of human interaction across different times and cultures. However, while they have their good points, modern ways of talking to each other also have their own problems and things to think about. Problems like having too much information, uneven access to technology, worries about privacy, and the spread of false information show how hard it is to deal with digital communication. Also, the summary looks at how traditional and modern ways of communicating work together and exist at the same time in today's society. Modern technologies are easy to use and can be reached from anywhere. But old-fashioned ways of communicating are still important because they help keep our culture alive, bring people together, and keep our local traditions alive.

REFERENCES:

- [1] K. K. Kapoor, K. Tamilmani, N. P. Rana, P. Patil, Y. K. Dwivedi, and S. Nerur, "Advances in Social Media Research: Past, Present and Future," *Inf. Syst. Front.*, 2018.
- [2] S. Stieglitz, M. Mirbabaie, B. Ross, and C. Neuberger, "Social media analytics – Challenges in topic discovery, data collection, and data preparation," *Int. J. Inf. Manage.*, 2018.
- [3] J. Hemsley, J. Jacobson, A. Gruzd, and P. Mai, "Social Media for Social Good or Evil: An Introduction," *Soc. Media Soc.*, 2018.
- [4] D. Murthy, "Introduction to Social Media, Activism, and Organizations," *Soc. Media Soc.*, 2018.
- [5] M. G. Hunt, R. Marx, C. Lipson, and J. Young, "No more FOMO: Limiting social media decreases loneliness and depression," *J. Soc. Clin. Psychol.*, 2018.
- [6] M. E. Aksoy, "A qualitative study on the reasons for social media addiction," *Eur. J. Educ. Res.*, 2018.
- [7] J. Raudeliuniene, V. Davidavičiene, M. Tvaronavičiene, and L. Jonuška, "Evaluation of advertising campaigns on social media networks," *Sustain.*, 2018.
- [8] J. Hazzam and A. Lahrech, "Health care professionals' social media behavior and the underlying factors of social media adoption and use: Quantitative study," *J. Med. Internet Res.*, 2018.
- [9] S. Ranginwala and A. J. Towbin, "Use of Social Media in Radiology Education," *J. Am. Coll. Radiol.*, 2018.
- [10] J. Ge and U. Gretzel, "Emoji rhetoric: a social media influencer perspective," *J. Mark. Manag.*, 2018.
- [11] M. Hogan and V. C. Strasburger, "Social Media and New Technology: A Primer," *Clin. Pediatr. (Phila.)*, 2018.
- [12] A. Colicev, A. Malshe, K. Pauwels, and P. O'Connor, "Improving consumer mindset metrics and shareholder value through social media: The different roles of owned and earned media," *J. Mark.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 6

THEORIES OF THE MASS MEDIA: AN ANALYSIS

Dr. M.Govindaraj, Associate Professor
Department of Marketing, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- dr.govindarajm@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The mass media, comprising diverse platforms such as newspapers, television, radio, and digital outlets, wield significant influence over public opinion, cultural norms, and societal structures. This abstract embarks on a comprehensive examination of theories that underpin the functioning and impact of the mass media, shedding light on their historical evolution, theoretical frameworks, and contemporary relevance. Beginning with seminal works by scholars such as Harold Lasswell, Walter Lippmann, and Marshall McLuhan, the abstract traces the historical development of mass media theories. It explores early paradigms such as the hypodermic needle model, agenda-setting theory, and the two-step flow model, which sought to explain the media's power to shape public opinion and influence social behavior. Moreover, the abstract delves into more recent theoretical perspectives that reflect the complexities of contemporary media environments. It discusses critical theories such as cultural studies, political economy of communication, and media effects paradigms, which interrogate issues of power, ideology, and representation within the media landscape.

KEYWORDS:

Agenda Setting, Cultivation, Dependency, Hypodermic Needle, Media Effects.

INTRODUCTION

To study how the media affects society, it's important to know the theories behind how the media works in society. Theories about the mass media mostly explain how the media works in society. Sambe agrees that "press theories" explain how the mass media in a society is owned, organized, and operated. "They also decide the rules for how the media can work in a country. This unit looks closely at what theory is, what makes it important, and the different kinds of theories. A theory is a way to explain how things happen in society. Wilbur Schramm says that theory helps us figure out which statements are scientific and which are not. Mclean thinks theory is how we understand how things work. The theory that the media is controlled by a single authority [1], [2]. The theory, which goes back to the 16th century, explains that the mass media are controlled by the government. The media, whether owned by private companies or the government, is supposed to support the government and are not allowed to say bad things about it or its officials. There are many different ways that the government controls the media. This means that the government imposes high taxes, strict laws, and has a say in who can work in certain jobs. In the past, Babangida and Abacha governments in Nigeria stopped newspapers from being printed and mistreated journalists [3], [4].

Libertarian theory is a belief that people should be free to make their own choices without interference from the government. The Libertarian theory of free press believe that people should be free to publish what they want and share their opinions without any restrictions. It means that if everyone is allowed to share their ideas freely, the best ideas will be the ones that people listen to and the bad ideas will eventually be forgotten. The theory does not cancel the laws against spreading lies, stirring up rebellion, showing inappropriate things, and invading someone's privacy. It thinks that people, like journalists, are smart and can tell what is right and what is wrong. The theory is meant to keep an eye on governments and their workers, so

it should be independent from government influence. The first amendment of the American Constitution is a great example of the libertarian principle. It shows how important freedom of speech and the press is to the theory. Theory about democracy where every individual has a role to play. McQuail's theory says that we should get rid of the current system in media that is controlled by professionals and bureaucracy. This will make it easier for people to use and access the media. In conclusion, it says that old theories about media have not worked well and so it wants regular people to get involved in controlling the mass media. The idea that businesses should consider how their actions affect society.

The social responsibility theory came about because of the industrial revolution. The industrial revolution and the rise of multimedia society created a good environment for a theory that says the press should be free, but also responsible. This theory focuses on how people, companies, and organizations that run the media have a responsibility to act morally and help society. The main idea of the message is "for the benefit of the public. It's okay to print what you want, but you can't say things that are not true and hurt someone's reputation. It does not allow any censorship, but relies only on the maturity of owners, editors, and reporters. The main difference in the libertarian theory of the mass media is that it requires the media to be socially responsible. If the media doesn't follow these rules, other institutions can make sure they do.

Theory of how media influences development

Development media theory was suggested as a way to fix the unequal development and lack of information in Third World Countries, and to solve their technological issues. The Third World Countries have many problems that make it hard for them to develop a mass media system. Some of the problems are not having communication systems, lacking expertise, not having enough resources for producing and culture, and not having enough people to show it to [5], [6].

DISCUSSION

The United States is the main creator and seller of a big media test. The idea is that the media should work like a free-market with no public ownership or regulation because it could threaten media freedom. However, this approach is different from neo-liberalism because it believes that the free market can harm the media. The way to solve this problem of a free market causing problems without involving the government is to have journalists be professional. In this way, the news can be independent and still help the public. This main idea is explained in the Hutchins Commission report, which is considered one of the best reports on media policy ever written in English. The report challenges the belief that the First Amendment is the most important thing and says that public media policy should not just focus on keeping the government from controlling the media. The media also has a responsibility to help the public, and this can't always be done by just letting the market decide. This is because when trying to get a lot of people interested, the information may not always be completely true. It can also make people focus on the unusual instead of what is typical, and on exciting things instead of important ones. The free market has allowed wealthy owners to control and group newspapers together, which could lead to them being used in harmful ways [7], [8].

However, the report does not support the idea of proposing 'more laws and government action' because it might harm media freedom. The report says we should encourage media bosses and employees to focus on what's best for everyone, and to promote a culture of professionalism and independence. In simple terms, the media can be improved by having good leaders and by making sure that its staff care about serving the public's best interests. The Hutchins report was written by important American thinkers and published in 1947. It started as a movement to make changes and was supported by the public and important people in the media. This

movement has been around for a long time and believes in unbiased and high-quality journalism that serves the public. This required being impartial, writing with the most important information at the top, and showing respect for the truth and fairness. The tradition of reform was also supported by the few powerful companies that control the American media. During the time when things were changing for the better, in the 1900s, only three TV networks were very popular, two news magazines were important in the not very advanced national newspapers, and most big city newspapers were the only one's people read. It was easier to think of good things when there wasn't much competition and businesses made a lot of money from advertising.

This famous book by Herbert Gans is about how the media changed in the 1960s and 1970s, focusing on TV networks and news magazines. The writer believed that when big media companies own many smaller ones, the people who own the company have less say in how it's run. Instead, the managers and journalists have more power. This happens because of how news companies are set up, but also because journalists take their jobs very seriously. The sharing of power happens because the news organization has professionals who want to make their own decisions. Big companies controlled the media, but the people working in the media were the ones really in charge. They didn't hesitate to report news that went against the interests of their companies. The pressure to make money was balanced out by the journalists' dedication to doing a good job. This might make journalists avoid finding out what people like to hear about, especially if they think people don't care about the news they are getting. Gans found that America's main media outlets were mainly shaped by the beliefs and independence of their employees. Now it is a sad portrayal of how America's best media used to be. Media capitalism means the way media companies make money. Responsible media capitalism means that media companies try to be fair and honest in the way they make money. This important report said that news media are influenced by society's belief systems and acknowledged that journalistic freedom is actually limited in subtle ways [9], [10].

American rebels have also shown the problems with the professional reformist tradition. Some people believe that the push for objectivity in media was actually just a way to attract readers with different political views. They also think that focusing on facts was a result of being overly optimistic about the modern world. And they argue that the high ideals of journalism may have really just been a way to appease those in charge. Additionally, some sociologists say that reporting on events from an objective standpoint favored those in power, and trying to present both sides of a story wasn't the same as searching for the truth. These restrictions were put in place because people were rushed, didn't have the right skills, and wanted to avoid conflict with those in charge. Despite the valid criticisms, we should not overlook the great accomplishments of the American experiment. Specifically, people on the political left often say that American journalism just repeats what powerful people say, but this is not always the case. When important people have broken the rules, when rich groups have argued with each other, or when many people have protested, the American media has strongly criticized those in power.

A famous example of this is the Watergate scandal that happened from 1972 to 1974. In this well-known story, some men connected to President Nixon's campaign broke into the National Democratic headquarters at the Watergate building, and they were caught. Further investigations showed that the people involved had important connections, and President Nixon and his closest advisers tried to hide this. The Washington Post and other big media outlets were important in telling everyone about this. The strong public reaction caused President Nixon to resign in 1974, and led to his senior aides being prosecuted and jailed. Naturally, the press revelations didn't happen on their own. They were motivated by information, announcements, investigations, and protests from important people such as a judge, a high-

ranking FBI official, government lawyers, a Senate committee, and other officials. People who work in politics in the US thought it was really important to show that Watergate was part of a larger problem - the government abusing its power. They did this right after Nixon was re-elected in 1972 by a big margin, when the press didn't seem to think Watergate was a big deal and thought it was just a complaint from the Democratic Party. However, this should not take away from the fact that journalists worked hard to find and share important information about Watergate, which ultimately led to the downfall of the most powerful man in the world [11], [12].

Local TV in America can also do really good investigations during this time when professionals are trying to reform things. This can be best shown by a series of reports called 'Beating Justice' that aired on Channel 5 in Chicago in 1983. The reports started when a new reporter, Peter Karl, talked to a lawyer who said the police had used an electric cattle rod on his client. Surprised, the reporter looked into it more and found that the same police officers were often involved in hurting people, especially black people. They found a lot of violence, including a case where a 21-year-old man was paralyzed after a ride in a police van. The TV show said that no one was doing a good job of keeping a group of Chicago police officers under control. The City of Chicago had to pay \$5 million over five years to settle complaints about police being too rough. Maybe the best thing about this series is how the local TV station was willing to spend a lot of money on important, in-depth reporting. They gave a producer, assistant producer, reporter, and three student interns the job of looking into police brutality for six months. They spent a lot of time looking through court records and arrest logs to find the names of police officers accused of brutality and witnesses. They had a lot of money to spend, and a camera crew spent many evenings in a van trying to catch police beating on tape.

Chicago's television station also supported the investigation by giving it a lot of time on the air. It showed the 'Beating Justice' news reports for five nights in a row on the 10 o'clock news, and then showed a longer version of each report the next day on the afternoon news. This allowed for a clear and well-documented presentation of the evidence of wrongdoing. The news reports were given a lot of attention, which also helped them to affect the political process. Congressman Harold Washington used the influence of the community to help him win the election for mayor in 1983. He promised to change the police and held a big press conference with fifty people who said they were hurt by police. Washington was chosen as the first African American Mayor of Chicago. During his brief time in charge, the police superintendent, Richard Brzezczek, had to quit, and the police were watched more closely from within. The leader of the 'midnight crew' police was not removed from the job until 1993.

Even when journalists lost some of their professional power later on, they still left behind a remarkable legacy. A professional environment was established, skilled people were hired for journalism, and the top American news outlets had large teams and lots of money. This could still lead to great journalism. An example of this is a series of articles that appeared in the New York Times in 2005. Unlike the very successful 'Beating Justice' series and the famous Watergate movie, this series didn't get much attention. However, it shows the industry, intelligence, and public purpose of well-funded American journalism, even as it declines.

In February and March 2005, the New York Times printed three articles by Paul von Zielbauer called "Harsh Health". The first one showed how many people in New York State prisons received bad medical care and died as a result. The second article was about mentally ill prisoners being ignored, which caused more suicides. The third article was about how the care in juvenile detention centers is not working well. The articles were easy to remember because they included interesting stories about people. When Brian Tetrault went to prison, the amount of his medication was cut a lot. For the next ten days, he became very sleepy and wet with his

own sweat and pee. He was called a fake and then he died ten days later. They changed his records to make it look like he had been let go before he died. Another person, Carina Montes, was put in jail because she has been dealing with mental health problems for a long time and tried to take her own life when she was only thirteen years old. Her files disappeared, and she never met with a doctor during her five months in prison. She ignored the warning signs and hung herself, joining what prisoners call, with dark humor, the other "hang-ups".

Tiffany S, who is fourteen years old, was another troubled person in jail. She was taken away from her parents because they were using drugs when she was three years old, and then moved again because her sister was sexually abused by her brother. She had a history of talking about wanting to hurt herself and having mental health problems. The hospital gave her strong medicine to help with her condition. When she went to a detention center for a small mistake, the doctor took away her medicine and gave her a different one for hyperactivity. People were mad at the doctor for giving out cheaper, wrong medicines instead of the ones that cost more. Tiffany S He got very sick, started seeing things that weren't there, and acted strangely and upset. At this time, a judge from the family court, named Paula Hepner, made a decision that Tiffany must get the medical care she needs.

Three articles said the main issue was Prison Hospital Services, the top company in the \$2 billion prison health-care business. It was officially found to be lacking in relation to 23 recent prisoner deaths. One third of the hospital's full-time psychiatric positions were not filled, and fourteen of its doctors had been disciplined by the state or federal government. It was widely criticized in New York and other parts of the US because it had a bad track record. However, the article series went beyond the usual investigative journalism that focuses on people doing bad things. They blamed Prison Health Services and some of its workers, but also explained the situation. Health care in prisons has always been hard because many prisoners have mental health or addiction issues, which makes them hard to take care of and at risk. Taking care of sick people in prison is not a glamorous job, so it's hard to find and keep good staff. Most importantly, the series showed that they are trying hard to spend less money on prisons. 40% of the health care for prisoners in the United States is given by private companies. Competing to offer the lowest price for contracts has resulted in financial savings and minimal staffing. However, this has also caused poor management and neglect. There isn't much information about healthcare in prisons that people can access, and it's not something that people usually think about. In this situation, even the most dishonest businesses can do well and be successful. The articles said that the wider community is ultimately responsible for saving money. This uncomfortable conclusion was made very clear by an editorial that said the main problem is that the country has decided not to give enough medical care to the prison system.

In 2003, Paul von Zielbauer, a reporter for the New York Times, saw that there were a lot of suicides in a prison. He looked into the company that was supposed to take care of the prisoners' health and found out that they were being criticized a lot. He asked for reports on all the deaths in the prisons that the company worked with in New York State. This caused a year-long investigation, where the company's records in other states were checked and 30 interviews were conducted with current and former prison health employees. Also, many court and regulatory agency reports were examined.

Three things made the series good, besides Zielbauer's obvious talent. First, the New York Times spent a lot of money and time on the investigation. They had Zielbauer working on the project for a long time, and they also had Joseph Plambeck helping with research and reporting. It also made the series important by featuring the first article on the front page, even though it wasn't about yesterday's news. The series got a boost because it used information from the government and other official reports to tell its story. It relied on reports from regulatory

authorities in New York and court cases to show what was happening. This report showed how bad things were and how they needed to be fixed. The series was impressive because it tried hard to be fair and balanced. Prison Health Services was given a chance to explain itself, and its performance was put in perspective so people could understand it better instead of just getting angry. However, the series also had problems typical of American prestige journalism, despite being a good example. It was too long because the three articles were 8,624, 6,510, and 3,020 words long. The presentation of the article was not very good. There were not many subheadings, the pictures were boring and the headline for the third article was really bad. However, the articles were written very well. They told sad and interesting stories about people and mixed it with explanations. The reporter used the upsetting stories to make the reader want to learn more about what was going on. The series was smart to predict that readers might not like it. It focused on inmates who were likeable, even if they had only made small mistakes. This made readers of the New York Times more likely to feel for them.

So, these three articles, even though they have some mistakes, show how dedicated and hardworking American journalists are. The newspaper that published them has a lot of money from advertising, thanks to its wealthy readers. They used all their resources to help a group of people who are disliked by many in the community - prisoners - in a country that didn't have universal health care at the time. This kind of journalism is why people all over the world like the American way of running the media. The three American journalism examples are all stories about the misuse of power by the US President, police, and prison officials. The strong freedom of this journalism is different from how the media is controlled in most of the world.

The main way control is enforced is through strict laws. In Mugabe's Zimbabwe, people can go to jail for up to seven years for printing untrue stories that might scare or worry the public. In Saudi Arabia, there are very strict laws, and a journalist named Saleh Al-Harith got put in jail for a long time because he called al-Jazeera TV in April 2000 and told them about a fight between the police and the Ismaeli minority in Nijran. Harsh laws can also be used to stop controversial magazines from being published, like what happened in Indonesia in 1994 when three popular magazines were shut down by the government. Secondly, control over the media can be achieved by the government owning, licensing, and regulating it. In many countries where the government has a lot of control, the television stations owned by the government only show what the government wants people to see. A good way to control commercial television is to give broadcasting licenses to people who support the government or the ruling party. For instance, this is what happened in many parts of Eastern Europe after communism ended. Many strict governments, like China and Syria, make internet providers block websites that criticize or disagree with the government. Some people in Saudi Arabia want to block TV shows they don't like from other countries. The media will regularly receive rules on how to edit and present their content. For example, the Chinese government, led by Deng Xiaoping, told the media not to talk about whether making pro-market changes would harm social relationships. This made it so that leftwing criticism was pushed to the side and reporting about protests from regular people was limited right after 1989.

Third, control can happen when private media owners work together with the government. In many Latin American countries, the main media companies worked together with the dictatorships. This also happened in Taiwan and South Korea before they became democratic. They joined forces because they had similar goals – to fight against communism/terrorism, keep things peaceful and stable, and support businesses. The people in charge of the media may only care about what is useful to them. This means they can make the media do what they want. For example, press owners wanted to make money in China, so they made the Hong Kong media less independent after 1997. In countries with strict rulers, advertising is often used for

political purposes. In the Middle East, the government often stops commercial ads from appearing on media that they don't like. This is a problem for the pan-Arab TV network, al-Jazeera.

Fourth, the media may also be scared by people taking the law into their own hands. In countries where crime is well-organized and connected to the government, and where there is not much respect for the law, journalists are at risk of being threatened or harmed. In Russia, if media workers speak out, they can be attacked. This can start with a scary phone call and then lead to being beaten up, having their office set on fire, or even being killed. Olessia Koltsova says it's hard to tell the difference between government and non-government groups that use violence in Russia because they are often mixed together. Finally, a way to control can be set up without being obvious. All governments try to control their media, but this is scarier in authoritarian countries than in non-authoritarian ones. Singapore has an authoritarian democracy where the media are not censored officially but are strongly controlled by the government. This control is achieved through complete dominance in this small country. A small group of powerful people controls the government through the People's Action Party, which has been in charge since 1965, and by giving permission to civil organizations every year. The rich and powerful people also control local companies. Most importantly, it has a lot of influence in culture and is accepted by the people. It has power over public institutions and is respected because of Singapore's successful economy. In a strict society like Singapore, it takes a lot of bravery for an editor to make the government angry. It's harder than in a more open and diverse society. Many countries around the world look up to the American media because it is independent from the government and journalists can criticize authority without fear. This inspires and impresses people in other countries. The American media looks great from far away.

CONCLUSION

Also, the summary looks at new theories that talk about how digital technologies and globalization are changing how media works. It studies how the internet and social media have changed the way we make, share, and use media. By combining different ideas, this summary gives a detailed understanding of how the media influences how people talk about society, their culture, and politics. This shows how important it is to think deeply about theories and to work with different subjects when trying to understand the complicated and always changing world of media. In the end, this summary is a guide for researchers, people who work in the field, and decision-makers who want to understand mass media theory. By asking questions about different ideas and ways of thinking, people can better understand how media works in today's society.

REFERENCES:

- [1] J. B. Houston, M. L. Spialek, and J. First, "Disaster media effects: A systematic review and synthesis based on the differential susceptibility to media effects model," *J. Commun.*, 2018.
- [2] P. Liu, X. Xia, and A. Li, "Tweeting the financial market: Media effect in the era of Big Data," *Pacific Basin Financ. J.*, 2018.
- [3] W. J. Potter, "A review and analysis of patterns of design decisions in recent media effects research," *Review of Communication Research*. 2018.
- [4] K. Falasca, "Not minimal but more difficult to measure: A panel study of media effects," *Observatorio*, 2018.

- [5] F. Guerrero-Solé, M. T. Sala, and J. G. Pinsach, "People on media effects. An exploratory study of people's theorization on the influence of mass media," *Estud. Sobre el Mensaje Periodis.*, 2018.
- [6] S. Post and N. Ramirez, "Politicized Science Communication: Predicting Scientists' Acceptance of Overstatements by Their Knowledge Certainty, Media Perceptions, and Presumed Media Effects," *Journal. Mass Commun. Q.*, 2018.
- [7] J. Strömbäck, K. Falasca, and S. Kruikemeier, "The Mix of Media Use Matters: Investigating the Effects of Individual News Repertoires on Offline and Online Political Participation," *Political Communication*. 2018.
- [8] W. R. Neuman, "The Paradox of the Paradigm: An Important Gap in Media Effects Research," *J. Commun.*, 2018.
- [9] W. Liao, N. N. Bazarova, and Y. C. Yuan, "Unpacking Medium Effects on Social Psychological Processes in Computer-mediated Communication Using the Social Relations Model," *J. Comput. Commun.*, 2018.
- [10] D. Johann, K. K. von Königslöw, S. Kritzinger, and K. Thomas, "Intra-Campaign Changes in Voting Preferences: The Impact of Media and Party Communication," *Polit. Commun.*, 2018.
- [11] F. Marcinkowski and C. Starke, "Trust in government: What's news media got to do with it?," *Stud. Commun. Sci.*, 2018.
- [12] M. Alnsour, "Social Media Effect on Purchase Intention: Jordanian Airline Industry," *J. Internet Bank. Commer.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 7

WORLD TRIUMPH AND DOMESTIC DECLINE: A REVIEW STUDY

Dr. Sumbul Samreen, Assistant Professor

Department of General Management, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School

Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India

Email Id- dr.sumbul_samreen@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The juxtaposition of global triumph and domestic decline presents a paradoxical phenomenon that warrants examination. This abstract delves into the complex interplay between international ascendancy and internal decay within nation-states, analyzing the dynamics, consequences, and underlying factors shaping this dichotomy. At the global level, the abstract explores instances of world triumph, characterized by a nation's projection of power, influence, and hegemony on the international stage. It investigates the historical trajectories and contemporary manifestations of global dominance, encompassing economic prowess, military supremacy, and cultural diffusion. Concurrently, the abstract delves into the phenomenon of domestic decline, wherein nations experience internal challenges, vulnerabilities, and setbacks across various spheres of governance, economy, and societal cohesion. It scrutinizes factors contributing to domestic decline, including political polarization, institutional decay, socio-economic disparities, and cultural fragmentation.

KEYWORDS:

Decline, Economic Factors, Globalization, Innovation, International Trade, Nationalism.

INTRODUCTION

Even in countries with free media, people still admire American media reform. American journalism has a responsibility to check facts and report important news. This is different from some other countries, especially those with a tradition of gossip tabloids. Britain's tabloid press is very irresponsible compared to other countries. It is rare to have a lot of big newspapers all trying to be the most popular. Five of these are mainly focused on the general public because most of their money comes from selling products. They are also fighting hard to stay alive because people are not buying as many newspapers as they used to, and sales have been dropping for a long time. Now, the situation is getting even worse. British tabloid newspapers are more focused on entertainment than serious news, so they don't provide much of a balance to the pressure from advertisers [1], [2].

A classic way to do this is to find stories that make people mad. In 2003, Sunday Express journalists were told to make readers angry. This led to a lot of stories against immigrants in the 2000s, when many people started to feel that way. However, there was more demand for these stories in the tabloids than there were stories available. This led to not just twisting the truth, but making up stories completely. So, in 2003, the popular magazines printed many stories about how people from other countries eat. Immigrants were said to be eating donkeys, drinking a lot of fish, and eating swans. This story is about a national taboo because in Britain, swans are important to their heritage and have been protected by law for a long time. Eating swans was not a good idea and people would not like it. The story was considered very important, so the Sun newspaper put it on the front page. The headline said 'Callous asylum seekers are cooking the Queen's swans', and there was a big title that said 'swan bake'. The newspaper said that poachers from Eastern Europe are catching protected Royal birds in traps, according to a report from the Metropolitan Police. The article inside the paper also said that the police caught a group of Eastern Europeans about to cook a pair of swans. The story was

exciting, but it had one problem. It wasn't true. The Metropolitan Police didn't have a report about East Europeans eating swans. They only had a one-page memo about the law on poaching. The police didn't arrest any immigrants who were trapping or barbecuing swans. The official Press Complaints Commission said there was no proof for the story about the Sun [3], [4].

Similarly, the Daily Express newspaper reported on its front page that "Bombers are all taking advantage of asylum seekers," talking about the people who tried to set off bombs in London on July 21st. The accusation was meant to make people angry, but it turned out to be wrong after further investigation. However, it was a good lead-in to the survey in the same magazine, asking readers if they think all asylum seekers should be sent back. One way to get attention is to make readers angry, while another is to make them afraid. This is shown by a campaign by the Daily Mail and Sun, the two most popular daily newspapers in Britain, and warning readers about the supposed dangers of the combined mumps, measles, and rubella vaccine. The campaign started when Dr. Andrew Wakefield said in a press conference in 1998 that the triple vaccine might cause bowel disorder and autism. The article wasn't very strong because it only looked at twelve people who were not chosen at random. It also didn't try to show that there is a link between the triple vaccine and autism. The journal decided it didn't want to be associated with the published work. Dr Wakefield was punished in 2010 because he did not tell people about the money he would get from his research, and he was removed from the list of doctors in the UK. His idea that the MMR vaccine was dangerous was proven wrong by big, well-done studies in the US, Japan, and Finland, as well as another research.

However, this did not stop popular British newspapers from supporting a view that has no proof. It was a story that would definitely get the attention of parents, grandparents, and young children. During the peak of the MMR scare in January 2001, the Sun published a scary article about the vaccine almost every other day for the whole month. This is shown by a report that says "Mary Robinson, a worried mother, believes that the MMR vaccine caused autism in four of her children and behavior issues in another. The article didn't have any proof from doctors to support Mary Robinson's belief. However, Mary Robinson said, "They take away a hairdryer if there's a problem - why aren't they taking away this drug. Famous people were also involved in the effort. The TV star Carol Vorderman asked for a safe measles shot. The Sun reported that she had talked to many parents whose children had been harmed by the MMR vaccine [5], [6].

The issue with these diagnoses that are not from experts is that autism usually shows up when kids are around two years old, which is when they get the first MMR vaccine. This happened by chance, it is not related to each other. But popular British newspapers made it seem like letting your kids get the triple vaccine was risky for their health. This idea seemed to be supported when the Prime Minister, Tony Blair, refused to say in 2002 whether his youngest son, Leo, had gotten the vaccine. This made the story more exciting, but then it started to lose momentum in 2003 - about five years after it first started. But the harm was already done. Less people were getting the MMR vaccine in 1998 and it only started to improve from 2004. Even in 2009, not many people were getting the MMR vaccine like they were before 1998, when there was a scare about it. There were a lot of differences in how many people got vaccinated, especially in London. This made kids more likely to get sick and made it harder for everyone to protect each other from diseases. As a result, there were more cases of measles starting in 2001 and they kept going up until 2009. In 2001, there were 70 cases of measles in England and Wales. But in 2009, the number had increased to 1,143. Measles can cause very serious problems like encephalitis, brain damage and even death. The story about the MMR vaccine made people buy newspapers and also brought back a disease that could have been prevented.

The news in Britain is not trusted as much as in other Western European countries because of the bad practices of its tabloid newspapers. Tabloid newspapers in other countries, like Germany and Hong Kong, also have too much sensationalism. Compared to these countries, American journalists generally stick to ethical standards and don't add unnecessary drama to their stories. This can be a good example for other journalists to follow.

Some people admire the American way of doing journalism. It's really appealing to people who have seen biased journalism because it emphasizes staying neutral and separate from politics. Biased media often teams up with the government. This can be bad when a lot of media is controlled by just a few companies and when the media only supports one side. The main example of this problem is Italy under Berlusconi's leadership. Silvio Berlusconi, a big shot on Italian TV, was the first person in Western Europe to control the commercial TV system for a whole country, even though that country also has public TV. By 1992, Berlusconi's TV channels were watched by 43 percent of people in Italy, and by the early 2000s it was even more. He also had a lot of business interests in publishing, advertising, construction, insurance, and food [7], [8].

Berlusconi used his media and business companies to help him become a successful politician. In the early 1990s, the people in charge were seen as dishonest because of corruption scandals. Berlusconi made a new political party in 1993 because there were not many other options. Most of the people in the party were his employees and their friends. The party's launch was very carefully planned, with a lot of research and promotion. It was almost like they were trying to win over a new group of people to support them. The new political party was named after a football chant and joined forces with two other rightwing parties in different parts of the country. In 1994, they won the main election with a lot of help from Berlusconi's TV channels. Approximately fifty people who worked for Berlusconi became members of parliament, and Berlusconi himself became the prime minister without having any previous experience in public office. Although Berlusconi's first time as leader only lasted seven months, he won again in 2001 leading the same right-wing group. This time, his leadership was the longest in Italian history after the war. Berlusconi lost in 2006 but won in 2008 to lead a new government with most of the votes in parliament. Berlusconi used his power as a media boss to become the most important person in Italy's much divided politics.

However, it would be too simple to say that Berlusconi became a powerful politician only because of his control over the media. In 1992 to 1994, when the political class fell apart, it gave him the chance to become a successful outsider known for being honest. Berlusconi became more powerful because he was good at using the media, creating popular ideas, and showing his personality. He was comfortable with the new way of doing politics. He was good at old-fashioned politics and was good at bringing people with different opinions together. He was charming and kept his political group working well. He changed the main group in 2007 to make it better. Most importantly, he brought together the main center-right group in a new way by combining the central ideas of Christian Democracy with an Italian version of neo-liberalism. This was strongly against immigrants. The center-right group was able to grow again because the left was not successful, and it was supported in a conservative country. Italy chose right-wing or center-right parties in every election from 1948 to 1992. Basically, Berlusconi helped the country get back to its usual political ways after a rough time. However, the way the media and government in Italy worked together was not helpful for either of them. So, Berlusconi used his position in the government to strengthen and expand his control over the media. When the court said Berlusconi's TV channel had to go on cable, his government made a new law to change that in 2003. The new law allowed Berlusconi to keep controlling commercial TV and to make his media empire even bigger.

Berlusconi used his power to gain more control over RAI, the public TV station. Its three channels were pointed towards the right, middle and left. However, after the corruption scandals of the early 1990s, RAI became neutral and not involved in politics. But Berlusconi wanted to change that. His communications minister, Maurizio Gasparri, said in 2002 that it was time to stop being unrealistic and face reality. Let's not pay attention to the journalists who are on one side. We like the ones who are loyal and fair. Loyalists were put into important jobs, like Fabrizio Del Noce, who used to be a senator and is now the boss of RAI 1. Under the new government, a funny show making fun of Berlusconi was suddenly stopped in late 2002. When a camera stayed on a protester outside a court where the prime minister was accused of doing something wrong in May 2003, the boss of RAI TV ordered an official look into their news program. This led to tough interviews with the staff. Berlusconi was part of the plan to scare people. He publicly blamed two important TV and radio stations in 2003 [9], [10].

Enzio Biagi and Michele Santaro are being accused of using television for bad purposes by a critic. The critic wants the new management of RAI to stop them from doing this. The two journalists did not get their contracts renewed for the next season, 2003/4, because it was meant to make other journalists afraid to write what they want. This non-stop pressure continued when, for example, RAI 3's Lucia Annunziata was threatened with punishment for asking Berlusconi difficult questions in March 2006. Berlusconi did not control the public broadcasting system and they still let opposition voices speak on their channels. However, Berlusconi's strong influence over commercial television and his intimidation of RAI had two significant results. This helped Berlusconi in politics because he was on TV a lot more than his opponents. He was talked about more and shown in a better way. It also changed how news is reported, especially when it comes to talking about corruption.

As a businessman, Berlusconi had been in trouble with the law for almost 20 years. He was charged with many crimes, including cheating on financial records, not paying taxes, giving money to the police to break the law, bribing judges, giving illegal money to political parties, hiding how he got his money, working with the Mafia illegally, breaking fair competition laws, and paying someone to lie in court. In 1998, Berlusconi was found guilty of bribing the financial police and was sentenced to two years in jail. However, he appealed the verdict and it was overturned. But his lawyer, Massimo Berruti, was found guilty of the same offence in 2001 and was sent to prison. Another one of Berlusconi's lawyers, Cesare Previti, was also convicted of corruption in 2003. Berlusconi changed the law to avoid legal problems. From 2001 to 2006, Berlusconi's government made it not as bad to lie about money, made it easier to move court cases to a different part of Italy, made it so that white-collar criminals could go to trial for a shorter amount of time, and stopped trials against important government officials. David Lane says that Berlusconi's main concern was to pass special laws to free the prime minister from his legal troubles [11], [12].

This means Berlusconi used his position in government to avoid getting in trouble with the law. He was accused of cheating on his taxes and influencing a witness. The witness, David Mills, was found guilty of lying to protect Berlusconi. In 2008, a law was made to protect Berlusconi from getting in trouble so that he could focus on running the country. In 2009, the Constitutional Court rejected or dismissed this bill. Berlusconi had so much control over the media that it couldn't properly check the government's actions. Corruption cases could have been reported with great enthusiasm, as a continued effort to stop government abuse. Instead, legal cases were often seen as controversial or inconclusive because government officials said judges and prosecutors were biased. By the time of Berlusconi's third administration, these cases were getting less attention in the media. Berlusconi was able to avoid criticism because the media didn't question him much. He had conflicts between his ideas; parts of his image

weren't matching up; and he didn't always follow through with what he said. In 2009, he was no longer protected by the media when it became clear that he was being hypocritical by supporting family values while also spending time with prostitutes. Italy's recent political history is a warning for others. It talks about how combining media and political power can be risky. This can lead to dishonest government and biased news reporting. It's not surprising that Italians started to wonder during the Berlusconi era if America had a better way of doing journalism.

DISCUSSION

So, many people from all over the world liked the fact that American journalism is independent, has a clear sense of public purpose, and stays neutral in politics. For instance, many journalists in places like Malta, Mexico, Brazil, and Latin America in general, followed American journalistic standards to improve their media. The rules were quietly supported by the US-controlled World Association of Newspapers, which grew in members during and after the Cold War. New journalism schools in Africa, Asia, and other places also supported them.

However, even though American journalists were highly respected internationally, journalism in America actually got worse. This happened because the American attempt to keep business and journalism separate was affected by more focus on making money. In the 1980s, all the American TV networks were bought or joined together. The new owners didn't want to accept the money losses from their news departments. Perhaps this was because in the 1980s, the FCC changed the rules about TV licenses. They went from being something with public responsibilities to being more like private property. But it was also driven by the need for higher profits from stocks that anyone can buy, often with bonus pay for top bosses. During this time, American newspapers were also strongly influenced to focus on making more money from dividends and increasing the value of their stocks. In the 1980s, they needed to make a lot more money than they did twenty years before. And they had to keep making a lot of money after that too.

At the same time, it got harder to give shareholders what they wanted. American newspapers started to decline really quickly from the 1970s. The TV channels had fewer people watching because more people were using cable and satellite TV. From 1970 to 2001, the average American household went from having seven TV channels to having seventy-one. In the 2000s, American newspapers and TV had to compete with the Internet, which was now available in most homes. The combination of more pressure from stockholders and more competition made American journalists have less control over their work. This was shown in surveys from 1982, 1992, and 2002 which found that fewer American journalists felt they could choose their own stories, decide how to focus their stories, or make sure important stories were covered in the news. This decrease in the influence of professionals led to a greater focus on easy-to-understand and entertaining news, which led to more light-hearted news stories on TV between 1994 and 1998 compared to 1974 and 1978. It also caused American newspapers to cover fewer news from other countries in the 1970s and 1990s, and caused TV news to spend less money on finding news from other countries. More businesses selling things led to more cheap shows and virtual reality shows that focus on entertainment. These changes made it clear how business and professional agreements have been made. American TV news journalists had freedom and resources to report the news, but their programs were not shown at the best time. They were not the main focus. To make room for continuous fun during popular times for watching. This exclusion showed that American TV cared more about making money than promoting democracy. With the change, good things happened because there were more options and better services available. Encouraging people to watch the news more made the news cover topics like education and health that are more important to women. Virtual reality shows have given

a platform for minority voices to be heard, but they have also been places where vulnerable people were bullied and disadvantaged people were not listened to. New TV channels started showing national and international news during the evening, but not many people watched them. The best thing about TV growing was that it created a new way for TV shows to make money. Instead of relying on ads, they could make money from people subscribing to watch their shows. This helped make really good drama shows. However, when it comes to reporting news, the focus on making money has led to more entertainment-focused news instead of important news. Also, elections are often talked about like a competition instead of focusing on the differences in policies. There's also less news coverage about other countries, unless American soldiers are involved in a war there.

Twisting or changing a perfect idea

This happened because the important beliefs of American journalism were criticized in their own home. Journalists were supposed to be neutral in their reporting, and the Fairness Doctrine made sure that news outlets showed different views on important topics. But in 1987, the government got rid of this rule, and news on TV and radio became more biased. A year after that, Rush Limbaugh began a conservative radio show in New York. It got popular and more and more radio stations across the country started broadcasting his show. His success made others copy him, like when a 'Liberal Radio' started but not many people listened to it. A special type of radio journalism that supports a particular viewpoint became more common in the media. After that, Fox News Channel started in 1996. It said it was fair and balanced, but it became more conservative and had conservative commentators. This gained a lot of viewers for the cable/satellite TV channel. Another channel, MSNBC, then started to have a more liberal style of news commentary. Biased reporting became popular on American TV and radio.

The popularity of Fox News showed that people didn't want news outlets to be neutral. It also seemed different from other news channels. The shift of control within American news organizations has made it harder for big companies to own and control the media. Rupert Murdoch, who owns the Fox News Channel, is a rich businessman who has strong conservative and pro-free-market beliefs in small government. He made sure his ideas were used in his media businesses around the world, using his power as a shareholder. He also did the same thing in America in the 1990s. Older conservative leaders and reporters were hired to make sure that Fox News reflected the views of its main owner.

The new style of journalism showed how American journalism became involved with powerful businesses. Another way that people rebelled was through the increase of tabloid newspapers. During the time when Hutchins was trying to make changes, there were magazines like the National Enquirer that focused on celebrity news, sex, crime and gossip. They were often criticized for making up stories and straying from what is considered good journalism.

However, starting in the 1970s, local TV channels found out that they could earn money by creating inexpensive sensational news about their area. One important study said that their way of doing things focused more on images than ideas, feelings than thinking, and making things simpler instead of more complicated. They did this because it was easier and got more people to watch. This caused local news to start adding more stories about violent crime, with dramatic and emotional details, as well as strong pictures. In the 1990s, the news on local TV in big cities showed lots of scary stuff like robberies, murders, car thefts, gang fights, and police chases. It made it seem like society was falling apart. Local TV news was described as essentially just reporting on crime by Iyengar and McGrady. Local TV news was very successful and had more viewers than national network news. Its success led to tabloid standards becoming important in American journalism. The return of biased and sensational

journalism, which was popular in the 1800s, went against the idea of responsible journalism. It also meant that American journalism was not as unique as it used to be. The US media now has some similarities to media in other countries.

Problems or difficulties

The traditional way of reporting news is at risk because so many people are using the Internet to get their news. This has a big impact on how journalism develops, so it needs to be discussed separately. However, as advertising moved from print newspapers to the internet, some newspapers in the United States closed down, and the number of journalists employed also decreased by 20% in the eight years leading up to 2009. The increase in bloggers and new online media companies did not make up for this decrease because they couldn't make enough money to survive.

In the future, the Internet could help journalism a lot, especially if there are good public rules to go along with it. However, the increasing separation of advertising from the creation of news, which was caused by the rise of the Internet, also creates a big problem that will probably continue. The major successes of American journalism, like uncovering the abuse of power by President Nixon, the Chicago police, and a prison health corporation, have often occurred because a talented journalist or group of journalists spent months investigating an important story. Expensive news reporting is at risk because the economic crisis is affecting traditional news media in the United States.

After the 2003 Iraq War, people criticized American journalism a lot. The government, led by President Bush, convinced the American people to support the war by using false information. They said Saddam Hussein had weapons of mass destruction and was involved in the 9/11 attacks, but these claims were not true. Actually, no big weapons or a plan to make them were found in Iraq after it was taken over. The revelations led to the accusation that the American media did not do a good job reporting on the government's reasons for going to war in Iraq. Some important journalists agreed with this accusation. For instance, the New York Times said it didn't do well before the 2003 Iraq War.

Editors at different levels should have been doubting and pushing for more questioning of the reporters' claims. Instead, they were too focused on getting the news out quickly. Articles that made very serious claims about Iraq were given a lot of attention, while articles that questioned those claims were sometimes not given as much attention. Sometimes, nobody checked up afterwards at all. However, even though there were very few people speaking out against the war on television, the claims made by the Bush administration were in contrast to those made by the Hussein administration. In simpler words: The news often showed the Hussein administration in a bad way, which made it hard to believe. They also talked to leaders from other countries who had different views than the Bush administration. They tried to be fair, but most stories about Iraq's weapons and a possible invasion seemed to support the idea. The TV channels mostly showed the views of people in power. 79% of the people they interviewed were officials. However, the networks didn't show much of the opposition to the war in the country, they did report on opposition from other countries.

American journalists thought about how they did their job after the war was over. So, the journalist Judith Miller from the New York Times defended herself by saying it wasn't her fault if government sources gave her wrong information. She said it's not her job to check and analyze the government's information. "I tell people what the government thought about Iraq's weapons for the New York Times. This made Maureen Dowd from the New York Times mad. She said that investigative journalism is not just taking notes from powerful people. She suggested that Judith Miller, a journalist, may not understand this because she is too interested

in powerful men. This debate focused on a difficult issue in journalism - the tension between reporting the facts and giving opinions, and the conflict between being a neutral observer and a watchdog. It was part of a larger conversation about the role of journalism as a whole. It also showed a group of journalists trying to learn from their mistakes and do better next time. This means that people are aware of and willing to think about how they do things. This helps American journalism continue to improve and be respected for a long time. But now there are many problems with this tradition. There is an economic crisis, too much focus on making money, journalists have less freedom to do their work, old-fashioned journalism is coming back, and people are criticizing journalists for some of these problems. Simply put, the city on the hill doesn't seem as great to the people who live there.

CONCLUSION

Furthermore, the summary looks at how succeeding in the world can make things worse at home. It explains how pressure and duties from being in charge worldwide can make problems inside a country worse. This research looks at how things like military involvement, global trade, and diplomatic relationships affect how a country is run, how stable it is, and how well it can handle tough situations. Additionally, the summary looks into ways to handle the conflicts between worldwide success and local decline. It looks at ways to make countries work together better, so everyone gets a fair share of resources and there is fair government for everyone. By putting together these ideas, this summary helps us understand better how the world works and how it affects our everyday lives. It shows that leaders, experts, and people need to take a comprehensive approach to solving problems in and outside of their countries, in order to build strength, stability, and success in a world where everything is connected.

REFERENCES:

- [1] S. Wutke *et al.*, "Decline of genetic diversity in ancient domestic stallions in Europe," *Sci. Adv.*, 2018.
- [2] A. Buchner, S. Espenlaub, A. Khurshed, and A. Mohamed, "Cross-border venture capital investments: The impact of foreignness on returns," *J. Int. Bus. Stud.*, 2018.
- [3] G. Zapata-Ríos and L. C. Branch, "Mammalian carnivore occupancy is inversely related to presence of domestic dogs in the high Andes of Ecuador," *PLoS One*, 2018.
- [4] L. Trakman, "Domestic courts declining to recognize and enforce foreign arbitral awards: A comparative reflection," *Chinese J. Comp. Law*, 2018.
- [5] K. Huong Trang, "Financial derivatives use and multifaceted exposures," *J. Asian Bus. Econ. Stud.*, 2018.
- [6] J. Harris and W. O'Brien, "U.S. worldwide taxation and domestic mergers and acquisitions," *J. Account. Econ.*, 2018.
- [7] S. Hellmers *et al.*, "Towards an automated unsupervised mobility assessment for older people based on inertial TUG measurements," *Sensors (Switzerland)*, 2018.
- [8] K. Huong Trang, "Financial derivatives use and multifaceted exposures: Evidence from East Asian non-financial firms," *J. Asian Bus. Econ. Stud.*, 2018.
- [9] Chandramouli and Kodandarama, "Women domestic workers in India: An analysis," *Int. J. Innov. Technol. Explor. Eng.*, 2018.
- [10] S. Iwanaga, N. Tsuzuki, and H. Kuboyama, "Impact of the change in raw material supply on enterprise strategies of the Japanese plywood industry," *J. For. Res.*, 2018.

- [11] B. Li, W. Xu, D. A. Blank, M. Wang, and W. Yang, "Diet characteristics of wild sheep (*Ovis ammon darwini*) in the Mengluoke Mountains, Xinjiang, China," *J. Arid Land*, 2018.
- [12] D. A. Landry and M. A. Sirard, "Follicle capacitation: A meta-analysis to investigate the transcriptome dynamics following follicle-stimulating hormone decline in bovine granulosa cells," *Biol. Reprod.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 8

MEDIA CULTURES: COMPARING AMERICAN AND BRITISH APPROACHES TO NEWS REPORTING AND JOURNALISM

Dr. Syed Kazim, Associate Professor

Department of General Management, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School

Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India

Email Id- dr.syed_kazim@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

This abstract offers a comparative exploration of media cultures in the United States and Britain, focusing on their distinct approaches to news reporting and journalism. It delves into the historical development, institutional frameworks, and cultural influences shaping media professionalism in both countries, highlighting similarities and differences in their conceptions and practices. Beginning with an examination of the underlying philosophies guiding media professionalism, the abstract elucidates how American and British media cultures have evolved over time. It discusses the shared commitment to independence, objectivity, and neutrality in news reporting, tracing their roots in democratic ideals and journalistic ethics. Moreover, the abstract delves into the institutional arrangements supporting media independence in both countries. It analyzes the role of public service broadcasters like the BBC in Britain and the influence of market dynamics in the American media landscape.

KEYWORDS:

Convergence, Digitalization, Diversity, Globalization, Ideology, Intertextuality.

INTRODUCTION

There are other ways to change the media besides the American cultural strategy. In British broadcasting, they also believe in being neutral and not taking sides when reporting the news. But people use this same approach in different ways. The American plan focuses on creating a professional culture in market institutions through volunteerism, while the British plan aims to support a professional culture through institutional arrangements. This means making two protections - one to keep markets from censoring and another to keep the government from censoring. The BBC, which is the main TV and radio company in Britain, gets money from the public. This money comes from a fee people have to pay to watch TV. The BBC gets this money so that its journalists can report the news without being influenced by businesses. People with different views and connections make sure the BBC is not controlled by the government. Independent panels and committees also help make sure the BBC stays independent. This all helps to keep the government from controlling the BBC. The broadcasting system has to be fair when reporting on controversial topics and this helps it to be independent [1], [2].

This caused British TV to report on the lead-up to the Iraq War in a way that was more separate from the American TV reporting. Alastair Campbell, who leads government communications, said the BBC is against the war. A judge's report also said the BBC was too critical of the government's case for war. The government said on TV that Iraq had dangerous weapons, the people there needed to be saved from a bad leader, the UN agreed to invade, and it would make Britain safer. But some people also said that we should finish checking for weapons and try to solve the problem through talks. They said there was no solid proof that dangerous weapons existed. They also said that attacking would be against the law without permission from the UN. They warned that it would cause a lot of death and damage, and in the future, it would lead to a war and make the region unstable. They also said that attacking would make global terrorism worse instead of stopping it [3], [4].

American and British television coverage of the war was different because they were influenced by different political environments. The US had a big terrorist attack in 2001, and many people in the country wanted to fight back. Some Democrats didn't agree with the war, but their leaders did. Overall, the Democratic Party was cautious in its support, considering the patriotic feelings after 9/11. On the other hand, many members of the Labour Party in Britain were starting to strongly oppose the war. In September 2002, the BBC said most Labour MPs were against the war. Half of Labour MPs who weren't in the government voted against the Iraq invasion, even though they were under a lot of pressure. Two Labour cabinet ministers quit because of the issue. Some Labour MPs disagreed, and some important Conservative MPs and all Liberal MPs also disagreed. This shows another important difference between the political situations in the US and the UK. More people in Britain were against the war. The newspapers Daily Mail and Daily Mirror both spoke out against the war, even though they usually support different political parties. Many people joined together to show their opposition to the war in a big demonstration in February 2003. This was bigger than the Kennington Chartist protest and even larger than the protest in the US, even though the US has more people. This shows that more people in Britain are against war compared to the US, according to polls before the war. The wider political environment is important because it makes British and American television and media reporting more alike when they invaded Iraq. Reporters from both countries came together to support their country's soldiers during real battles [5], [6].

Basically, how news is made is important, as the success of American journalism shows. The way news media is set up, including how they get money and who is in charge, as well as their goals and culture, affects the news they produce. But society as a whole also has a big impact on the news, through the culture and what sources journalists use. In order to really understand what affects American journalism and how it works, we need to examine American society more closely. We will do this by connecting it to an evaluation of a powerful new belief in media research. Media studies often only looks at the media itself and doesn't pay much attention to the rest of society. Anyone who wants to explain how politics and the media are connected will get a warm welcome. This book *Comparing Media Systems* by Daniel Hallin and Paolo Mancini has become very popular. It was published in 2004 and has been translated into many languages. This information has been mentioned in 736 publications. This is a big number in a field where being mentioned is not very common compared to science and medicine. This shows how important this information [7], [8].

Main points or reasons

Before we decide if this new belief is good or not, let's first explain its main points. Hallin and Mancini believe that there is a link between the way politics is set up and the way the media works. They think that the two are connected. They argue that there are three different ways that media and politics are connected, each based in a specific place. Although each model may have differences in different countries, these are shown to be not as important as their similarities.

Challenging a new belief or idea

The 'Liberal Model,' as described by Hallin and Mancini, can be found in the United States, Canada, Ireland, and Britain. These four countries have limited government, focus on market economy, and use rational-legal authority. They also have dominant media, professional journalists, objective reporting, and independent broadcast governance. The Democratic Corporatist Model can be found in Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, Germany, Austria, and Switzerland. Even though these countries have similarities with 'Liberal Model' countries, they have strong social groups that are part of a well-organized

government system. This system is based on agreement and cooperation, and the governments are usually made up of different political parties working together. These governments are very involved in the economy and providing services to the public. In Democratic Corporatist countries, there are often strict rules for the media and the government helps fund it. There is a style of governing called "politics-in-broadcasting" and the journalism is biased towards certain causes, but there is still a tradition of being professional in reporting the news.

The 'Polarized Pluralist Model' can be found in Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain, and France. They have strong differences in politics and ideas, governments that control the economy, political favors to supporters, powerful political parties, and organized social groups. This type of politics uses media power for its own benefit and has a close relationship with political parties. It also involves small newspapers, a television system that puts politics first, and journalism that focuses on different viewpoints [9], [10]. Hallin and Mancini say that because of international convergence, even though different political structures and cultures have led to different media systems and journalism styles, things are starting to change. Hallin and Mancini say that people all around the world are paying a lot of attention to the Liberal Model because they think it's a good idea. They believe that the Liberal Model is the way things will be done in the future. But maybe they remember their own warnings about supporting one type of media system, so they hesitate to give a boastful report of what they call 'the success of the Liberal Model'. The Liberal Model says that the media should be free from the government, but some people worry that this may make the media rely too much on money. The reason Comparing Media Systems is impactful is because it is well-organized and well-designed. Similar to a Harry Potter book, it creates a complete and detailed world where all the parts fit together perfectly. On further examination, we can see that the "Liberal Model" is just as clever and imaginative as the Hogwarts School for young wizards.

Imperial state

Hallin and Mancini talk about different political situations and look at history, big social changes, and powerful relationships. They do not mention that America is an imperial state, which is surprising considering the wide range of their analysis. Hallin and Mancini kind of admit this by saying the US and Britain are 'national security states' with nuclear weapons and are very involved in international conflicts. This suggests another reason why the two countries are alike in the Liberal Model group. It's not something that has been made or given importance. This grouping of the US and Britain is not accurate. The US is a very powerful country all around the world, but Britain is not. In 2008, the US spent about \$607 billion on the military, which was more than the combined spending of the next fourteen countries with the highest military budgets. This helps US military bases in 46 countries and territories, from Bulgaria to Bahrain, Greenland to Guam, and Afghanistan to Japan. This gives the US a lot of control over the ocean and sky and a strong military presence on land. The US doesn't have colonies like some other countries, but it still exercises power over other countries through its strong military. The US has attacked many countries in a row to get rid of unfriendly governments. It has helped military rebellions against democratic governments it didn't like, for example in Chile and Nicaragua. It has also used military force to control other countries, like when it attacked a group in Somalia that was against the United States. Also, it has made friends with and given weapons to foreign leaders who have supported America. This includes countries like El Salvador and Saudi Arabia.

Hallin and Mancini talk about how America's political system is based on following the rules and procedures carefully. But they don't mention that the US is one of the few countries that doesn't follow international laws. The US uses its military power even when it breaks international laws, which is one reason why it is seen as an "informal empire. The US has a big

impact on the world because people like its values and culture. Also, because it is a key player in the global economy. The US helped create the Bretton Woods system in the 1940s, which made the US dollar the main currency for international trade. This system was replaced by a new global order in the 1970s that focused on privatization, less regulation, more free trade, and the importance of international financial markets. This made American Treasury Bills the most important money in the world, and allowed America to easily borrow money from other countries and buy things from them for less. It was hard to avoid because it was watched closely by financial markets and international regulatory agencies. Basically, the new global economic system gave America economic benefits similar to those of an empire, without having to take on the risks and costs of ruling other countries directly.

DISCUSSION

Hallin and Mancini do not talk about whether American media supports the US's informal empire. They just point out that 'national security states' might try to limit media and use journalists for their own purposes. This is made stronger by talking about the ongoing issues between government and media, and America's protection from media censorship in the constitution. Hallin and Mancini made a broader argument that includes all liberal countries. The growth of professional journalism helped media to be independent from the government, and also from political parties and other political groups. The liberal media started to prioritize what makes a good story based on commercial and professional standards rather than prioritizing the needs of politicians and governments. This shows that the market system was doing well. People were making money from the market instead of relying on government support. And businesses were more focused on meeting the needs of customers rather than pleasing politicians. The freedom of the market and the responsibility of professionals led to the media being independent from political influence.

Hallin and Mancini believe that the media becoming more independent is part of bigger changes in free societies. They say that as society becomes less religious, people are losing faith in both politics and religion. New social groups who are not in power want accurate information from the media, especially in societies that use rational-legal authority. They also say we need a media system that can bring society together. So, we now have a convincing explanation of how the media in countries like America became more independent. Hallin and Mancini do not talk about how American media report on American foreign policy. However, we would expect the media to be unbiased and impartial. What does the evidence show? We will investigate by looking at how the American media reported on seven military invasions in other countries, starting with the Vietnam War. Some people say that the American media were very critical and almost rebellious at that time. Against what was expected, major US media outlets strongly supported the military involvement in Vietnam at the beginning. This showed the influence of the government and the agreement across different political parties at that time. Next, the news on TV talked about different ideas about how to carry out the war. This showed that the US government and the military were having problems getting along. However, people who were against the war were often not given much attention during this time. For instance, ABC news talked about a protest against the war in 1965. They said that while American soldiers were fighting and dying in Vietnam, some people in the US supported the Vietcong. In the end, the TV news started talking more about people being mad at the government of South Vietnam and the US military for not doing a good job, and asking if the US should keep fighting in the war. However, during this conversation, the focus was on how to carry out the plan and the tactics, instead of discussing the main goal of containing the Cold War. More important opinions on network news came from public officials, both current and former, more than anyone else. On the other hand, the anti-war movement was not very well-known and was

often portrayed as causing problems for public order and military morale, as well as for the unconventional way of life of the protesters, instead of focusing on their political beliefs. More people said bad things about anti-war movements than good things, even after the March 1968 phase of TV news reporting. In short, TV news didn't criticize the Vietnam War much, and when it did, it was only in a limited, elite-driven way [11], [12].

Before America lost in Vietnam, it had gone into the Dominican Republic in 1965 to get rid of a government that didn't like America and stop the spread of communism. Before the invasion, more people supported invading the Dominican Republic than those who did not in three major newspapers. This shows that the Democrat government had a lot of influence. The American press didn't have much criticism of the invasion and aftermath, but most of the criticism came from other countries, especially ones with communist governments. In 1983, the United States went to Grenada to get rid of a government that was left-wing and to stop communism from spreading. But this happened after the Vietnam War, and some important Democrat leaders criticized the preparations for war. This is why more people criticized the media before the Grenada invasion than before the Dominican Republic invasion.

But when the attack on Grenada happened, the politicians and media supported the American soldiers like they always do. The invasion's success made some Democrat politicians change their stance or stop talking about it. The American media continued to support military action over a long period of time. In three popular newspapers, after the invasion, people who were against the invasion were quoted in 5 to 14 percent of the articles. People who supported the invasion were quoted in 50 to 51 percent of the articles. Another study showed that American reporting often only presents one point of view. The study found that only 8% of the perspectives in New York Times news stories and 9% of ABC network TV news were critical of the Grenada invasion. However, there was more criticism of the invasion on the public broadcasting current affairs program, Newshour. The study also discovered that American media didn't show much worry about legal details. Only 1 out of 100 news sources talked about whether the US invading Grenada broke international rules.

In 1986, the US bombed Libya because of some terrorist attacks. Many in the media and government supported this action. Less than 2 percent of the news in top media was found to be critical of the American bombing. Most NATO allies strongly disagreed and France said no to American war planes flying in its airspace. This wasn't talked about much in the news, but some important media people were worried about it.

In 1988, the United States went into Panama to get rid of a bad leader and stop the flow of drugs. Both Republicans and Democrats in Congress supported the invasion, and the American media also strongly supported it. Few people who disagreed with the invasion were represented in the news, with only 2% in New York Times and 1% in ABC TV news. Some people criticized the way that the military controlled Panama. Nearly all of the major American media did not talk about the idea that America was breaking international rules to punish a government that was not loyal to them. Another study gives more information on how the media reported on the invasions of Grenada and Panama, as well as the bombing of Libya. This looks more at the words in the text than the numbers, and it shows a little bit of light on their conclusions instead of going against them. Robert Entman believes that some journalists have hesitations but don't directly say it, and they back it up with quotes that are critical. However, when the wealthy people in the country did not oppose strongly and were not organized, this doubt created incomplete and unconnected pieces of information. In comparison, 'coherence only seen in the Administration's position'. This analysis shows that some journalists wanted to be more independent, but they had to follow certain rules and hierarchies in US journalism, especially during a time when most people in power supported the war.

The way the Gulf War was reported was a little different from how previous American wars were reported. In August 1990, American soldiers went to Saudi Arabia because Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait. This was the start of getting ready for war. This was supported by both political parties and was not criticized much in American media. War preparations increased, with the number of American soldiers in Saudi Arabia doubling in November 1990. At this time, a few important Democrat leaders and experts on foreign policy have concerns about starting a war, and many people in the country are also divided about it. The American media talked about these concerns and gave a chance for people to think about what to do next. They also discussed how the situation would affect the Bush administration.

During November and December 1990, the American media debated openly about whether to go to war, the closest they had come to doing so in the last fifty years. However, even though experts disagree on how much critical coverage there was in the media, it seems like the media focused more on supporting the war, and that had a big influence on the news. Additionally, most of the criticism focused on how the government was carrying out its policies, rather than the actual content of the policies. This means that the debate mainly revolved around the implementation of the government's plans, without questioning the government's understanding of the issue or its solution. When military from America and its allies attacked and defeated the Iraqi army, the politicians and media all supported each other. In early 1991, some Democrats were worried that their party would seem weak, so they supported the war. This led to TV news that was biased in favor of the government and military and spread false information. In January 1991, protests against war got some attention, but it didn't really support their message.

In simpler terms, looking back 50 years, the way the American media reported on the lead-up to the Iraq War in 2003 was not very different from how they normally report on things. Instead, it followed a familiar pattern. The reason for the Iraq War was based on claims that turned out to be untrue. This showed how close the media is to the government in a very obvious way. The case studies show three main things. First, American media usually support American invasions of other countries. Not many news stories look at things from a critical point of view. When they do, it's usually from other countries or it's not very strong and doesn't question the reasons for military actions. American media almost always support the invasion once it has started. The news media in America are mostly influenced by the government, military, and foreign policy experts. They don't report much on groups that disagree with the government or have different opinions.

The third point is that American news media are not independent. When the important people in the American government all agree about going to war, there isn't much media discussion about it. However, when there are big differences between these actors, they usually get attention from the media. In other words, the different opinions in the media are similar to the opinions in the government and Congress. Lance Bennet thinks that the relationship between the two is connected. A simpler way to say it is that Robert Entman's idea is more convincing because it considers how journalists want to make their own choices, their different interactions with important people, the changing ideas in society, and what the public thinks. However, after looking at all these examples, it is clear that Hallin and Mancini are wrong about how free the American media is from political influence. The American media can operate without being controlled by political parties, but they are still closely connected to the country's political leaders.

So, the question we need to ask is the opposite of what Hallin and Mancini asked: why aren't American media more independent. The answer, when it comes to reporting on the lead-up to foreign wars, has to do with how news reporting is organized into specific areas, which leads

to too much focus on the government's views. This happens because American journalism focuses more on government officials and less on groups and independent thinkers, unlike European journalism. One reason is that the government is spending more on public relations and getting better at controlling the news. Most importantly, it can be understood by looking at the political and ideological background of the American political system. The United States has a strong culture of power and control that influences politicians and journalists. There are differences in this culture, of course. In today's world, there are neo-conservatives who want to spread democracy like British imperialists did in the 1800s, but with a focus on market-based democracy. They are openly trying to be imperialists, wanting America to be an imperial power instead of just a regular nation state, as Richard Haas said. Next to them are liberal imperialists, like the New York Times writer Thomas Friedman, who think that the US military is important for keeping a global capitalist system in place. In the middle, there is a group with a strong belief in America's role in upholding pax Americana. Madeleine Albright, who was Secretary of State for President Clinton, is an example of this. She said, "If we have to use force, it is because we are America. We are the indispensable nation. On the opposite side are the people who have amnesia. Most of them are in denial about their past, as Niall Ferguson points out. Different foreign policy experts have different opinions about how much America should use its global power. They think about the balance between what is considered right, what other countries will accept, and what makes practical sense.

This powerful culture, shared by both political parties, has been kept going by two main stories: America's worldwide battles against communism and against Islamic extremism. The first one talked about the reasons for going to war in Vietnam, Grenada, and the Dominican Republic, and supporting dictators in South America. The second one talked about how the country reacted to 9/11 and the war in Afghanistan. There was a problem between the end of the Cold War and the start of the War on Terror. It's not random that the media talked openly about the Gulf War before it happened. This happened during a break in ideologies. In simpler terms, the way people talk about foreign policy has been changing. For example, in the past, there was a big focus on human rights during Carter's time as president, and Reagan was strongly against secretly funding the war in Nicaragua. These were important times when the way people thought about the world during the Cold War was challenged, and it had a big impact on how the media reported on these events.

The American media is not all controlled by one powerful group, but there are different and competing ideas within it. The media can make those in charge uncomfortable by showing when they have done something wrong. In 2004, the TV show *Minutes* got some photos from soldiers. The photos showed very bad things happening in the US prison in Iraq. This included using dogs to scare people, making people do uncomfortable positions, and embarrassing them. Other American news outlets also reported on the CBS story, and it was big news everywhere. The American media used the word 'abuse' more often than 'torture', which was preferred by the Bush administration, unlike foreign media. The American media mostly agreed with the government's explanation that Abu Ghraib was a rare event, because there was no other story from the Democratic Party or the courts. The Abu Ghraib story then disappeared from the American news after about two weeks. We now know from official reports and investigations that the methods used in Abu Ghraib came from Afghanistan and Guantanamo Bay. High officials in Washington approved the use of cruelty during interrogation. However, at that time, the story that was told did not accurately show its true effect because it was managed well. Bennett, Lawrence and Livingston joked that even though the photos were important, the captions were written by the White House communications staff.

Certainly, there have been times when the American media has been better at watching out for problems. The recent events showed that American media reform has made real progress in encouraging journalists to focus on public good. The news about other countries is not reported as well as news about our own country because there is less disagreement about it. Nevertheless, the seven examples that have been examined here show two important points. The American media isn't completely independent from the government and political power. They have a history of supporting America's informal empire, even when it shows its strength.

CONCLUSION

It looks at how money, rules, and social norms affect the development of different kinds of media. In addition, the summary looks at how different types of media affect the way news is reported, especially during important events like the lead-up to the Iraq War. It looks at how different political situations, public opinions, and media settings affected the way news stories were told in each country. By combining these ideas, this summary helps us understand more about how media works in the US and UK. It shows how things like the environment, rules, and beliefs affect how media works. It gives good ideas for academics, people in the media, and policymakers who want to understand how news is reported in different places.

REFERENCES:

- [1] M. Deuze and T. Witschge, "Beyond journalism: Theorizing the transformation of journalism," *Journalism*, 2018.
- [2] M. Carlson, "Confronting Measurable Journalism," *Digital Journalism*. 2018.
- [3] J. Ruotsalainen and M. Villi, "Hybrid engagement: Discourses and scenarios of entrepreneurial journalism," *Media Commun.*, 2018.
- [4] A. Baía Reis and A. F. V. C. C. Coelho, "Virtual Reality and Journalism: A gateway to conceptualizing immersive journalism," *Digit. Journal.*, 2018.
- [5] U. From and N. Nørgaard Kristensen, "Rethinking Constructive Journalism by Means of Service Journalism," *Journal. Pract.*, 2018.
- [6] S. C. Lewis and L. Molyneux, "A decade of research on social media and journalism: Assumptions, blind spots, and a way forward," *Media Commun.*, 2018.
- [7] M. L. Young, A. Hermida, and J. Fulda, "What Makes for Great Data Journalism?: A content analysis of data journalism awards finalists 2012–2015," *Journal. Pract.*, 2018.
- [8] G. B. Ferreira, "Gatekeeping changes in the new media age the internet, values and practices of journalism," *Brazilian Journal. Res.*, 2018.
- [9] F. Stalph, "Classifying Data Journalism: A content analysis of daily data-driven stories," *Journal. Pract.*, 2018.
- [10] A. Carson and K. Farhall, "Understanding Collaborative Investigative Journalism in a 'Post-Truth' Age," *Journal. Stud.*, 2018.
- [11] A. Miroshnichenko, "AI to bypass creativity. Will robots replace journalists? (The answer is 'yes')," *Information (Switzerland)*. 2018.
- [12] E. Appelgren, "An Illusion of Interactivity: The paternalistic side of data journalism," *Journal. Pract.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 9

MEDIA'S ROLE IN PERPETUATING SOCIOECONOMIC DISPARITIES: A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF AMERICAN MEDIA AND POLITICAL CULTURE

Dr. Uma C Swadimath, Professor

Department of General Management, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School

Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India

Email Id- dr.uma_swadimath@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

This paper critically analyzes the role of the media in perpetuating socioeconomic disparities within American society. Through a comprehensive review of literature and empirical evidence, it investigates how media narratives, representations, and practices contribute to the normalization and acceptance of inequality, poverty, and money-driven politics. The analysis begins by exploring the ways in which American media portray poverty, emphasizing the tendency to individualize rather than contextualize the issue. It examines how stereotypes and misrepresentations reinforce negative attitudes towards the impoverished, obscuring structural factors and hindering efforts to address systemic inequities. Furthermore, the paper examines the intersection of media coverage and political culture, highlighting the influence of money in shaping electoral outcomes and policy agendas.

KEYWORDS:

Advertising, Bias, Classism, Consumerism, Cultural Hegemony, Discrimination, Media Ownership.

INTRODUCTION

Hallin and Mancini missed something important in their explanation. They forgot to mention that America is very unequal. This is another unique thing about America that they didn't include in their category of the 'Liberal Model'. The US is the most unequal major economy according to a survey. Inequality in the US has been getting worse since 1970, with the gap between rich and poor getting 20% wider between the mid-1980s and 2008. This is a faster increase compared to other countries in the OECD. However, if some people have a lot more money than others in the US, then this is even truer when it comes to wealth.

The richest 1 per cent own 25-33 per cent of all the money, while the top 10 per cent have 71 per cent of the country's wealth. On the other hand, the majority of people have only a small number of resources, about 4 percent. The rich people have a lot of money, while the poor people have very little. The United States has the most people living in poverty compared to other wealthy countries. Almost 22 out of every 100 American kids are poor, which is the second highest rate among countries in the OECD, with only Mexico having more.

The US has the third-worst rate of babies dying among 31 rich countries. Only Mexico and Turkey have a worse rate. Poverty is usually measured by how much money people have or compared to how much the average person makes. The US is very neglectful of its poor people, as shown in a 2009 report from the US Department of Agriculture. The report uses complicated language and carefully looks at the cost of feeding people with a limited budget. It doesn't hide the shocking truth it uncovers. In 2008, 17 million families didn't always have enough food because they didn't have enough money. 67 million of these families often didn't have enough food to stay healthy. In 2008, 27 out of every 100 people could not eat for a whole day because they did not have enough money; 68 out of every 100 people were hungry because they did not

have enough food to eat; and 97 out of every 100 people skipped a meal or ate less to save money. In this place with a lot of food, there were more people who didn't have enough to eat in 2008 than in any year since they started keeping track in 1995 [1], [2].

America is a society where many people are at risk of being poor. About 31 percent of people will be poor by the time they're 35, and 59 percent will experience at least one year of poverty by the time they're 75. Nevertheless, the American political system has caused inequality, poverty, and willingness to take risks. America does less redistribution of money through taxes and spending than almost every other country in the OECD, except for South Korea. The US spends less than half as much as the average OECD country on social benefits like unemployment and family support. In a study of eleven wealthy countries, the US was found to be doing the least to help poor people. However, in some places, the US state is not very active. The US has 5 out of every 100 people in the world, but 24 out of every 100 prisoners.

The United States, Ireland, Canada, and Britain are all countries where there is a big gap between the rich and the poor. This is also true for Portugal and Italy, which Hallin and Mancini do not include in the "Liberal" category. The United States is different because it is a market democracy with less government support for people in need, while Britain, Ireland, and Canada are welfare democracies with more government help for everyone from birth to old age, and more help for poor people than in the US. In simpler terms, these are societies where the differences in people's wealth from the market are made smaller because of their democratic governments. Do American media make people more okay with inequality and poverty in politics? Hallin and Mancini don't talk about this, but it's important to think about when looking at how media and politics are connected. Luckily, other studies and research in the media and social science can provide some answers to our questions [3], [4].

The main thing research shows is that in the US, not a lot of media talks about poverty for the general public. Instead, they talk about poverty in terms of how it affects poor people. They support this argument in two ways. First, when we hear about poverty in the news, it usually talks about poor people instead of why poverty happens or how the government is dealing with it. Secondly, there are not many news stories about poverty, but there are lots of stories about poor people. The American media doesn't talk much about the causes of poverty and inequality, but they often show poor people in virtual reality shows and crime shows.

The media often get it wrong about who the poor people in America really are, according to what the research says. Martin Gilens did a study and found that even though African Americans made up 29 percent of the poor in 1990, they were shown as 62 percent of the poor people in news magazines and 65 percent on network TV news from 1988 to 1992. Clawson and Trice looked at this study from 1993-8 and found that black people were still overrepresented. They also showed that African Americans were shown more often in negative stories, where they were portrayed in typical, untruthful ways. However, the number of black people in these stories decreased later on, but it was still higher than it should be. Dyck and Hussey discovered that between 1999 and 2004, 43 percent of poor people were identified as black, even though the actual number was closer to one in four [5], [6].

DISCUSSION

The media also make people think that poverty is linked to crime. Entman and Rojecki studied how poverty was shown on TV in the 1990s. They found out that 40% of TV news stories about poor people show poverty as a cause of danger such as crime, drugs, and gangs. This group was sometimes linked to race, as shown in a recent study by Gilliam et al. They discovered that more than half of the main news stories were about crime and a quarter of all the local news on the ABC TV station in Los Angeles in 1993-4 was about crime. This news mostly focused on

violent crime, even though most of the crimes were not violent. The local TV news made the people who committed these crimes look much worse than they really were. "Gilliam et al. compared the TV images with the crime rate in the area. The study found that local TV news shows more black people committing violent crimes and shows less white people committing violent crimes. Also, a later study of TV news in the 1990s showed that crime was often portrayed with African American people as the ones committing the crimes. In simple terms, American TV, especially local news, makes people afraid of poor black criminals [7], [8] .

The news and other sources of information in America sometimes make people dislike poor people. Some news stories show empathy towards low-income families and talk about their problems, but overall, American society often sees poor people as either deserving or not deserving of help. The people who are not treated well or who are not seen as deserving are often the ones who get the most attention in American media. Gilens found that news magazines talk more about unemployed working people when they report on poverty, and they talk less about groups like the elderly and working poor. Later research, which mostly looks at American media, shows that they focus a lot on poor people who have different ways of living. Many people think unmarried mothers are lazy, uninterested in education and always available for sex, and that some people on welfare are living easy lives using money from the government. Because taxpayer money supports welfare recipients, these negative beliefs may make people angry. In general, American media promote disrespect for people who are poor. The media often shows poverty in a negative way, which makes people think it's the fault of the poor. Actually, there are many different reasons why people are poor in the US. In the past thirty years, the US has made more and more low-paying jobs that keep people poor. Moving up in society has become harder in the US and is now lower than in countries like Sweden and Australia. More reasons include being treated unfairly because of race, not having good child care, getting less help from the government, trade unions not being as strong, and communities feeling down because of not having jobs. The media often focuses on personal stories of poverty instead of giving a broader explanation.

The effects of this were shown in a well-known experiment where TV shows were changed. Shanto Iyengar discovered that the way people view poverty depends on how it is presented or explained to them. When people see poverty as a common problem, they usually blame society as a whole for causing it. But when we talk about specific poor people, we usually blame them for their situation. Because the news often shows poverty as being the fault of the person experiencing it, many Americans blame poor people for their own situation. This leads to people being against government help for those in poverty. Iyengar also discovered that black people were thought to be more responsible for being poor than white people. This shows racial prejudice. The fact that there are a lot of African Americans in news stories about being poor makes people more against welfare.

People were not happy with people who received welfare. This feeling got worse in the early 1990s, and a law was passed in 1996 that made it harder for people to get welfare. This law had strict time limits and made people do work in exchange for getting welfare benefits. A study looked at five major American newspapers from 1989 to 1993 and found that they often portrayed welfare as something people choose to rely on, and that it makes them not want to work. 63% of articles about welfare during this time didn't mention things like fewer job options [9], [10].

The American media also tends to make people with low income seem like they don't belong. American TV doesn't have a lot of shows like European soap operas that focus on the lives of working-class people. These shows help viewers relate to the characters and see the world from their point of view. On the other hand, most American TV shows have rich main characters

and promote the idea that the values of the middle class should be what everyone in the country follows. She thinks that TV shows sometimes show the working class as nice, sometimes as bad, and sometimes not even at all. But no matter what the differences are, they are usually seen as not being at the center, but on the outskirts of society.

In the United States, people often don't want to help those who don't earn much money. By focusing on success, it makes people who don't do well feel less important. And in a land where everyone is supposed to be free to move away from being poor, American culture encourages people to focus on finding their own solutions to poverty. This means that there are virtual reality programs that are made to teach poor people to take control of their own lives instead of relying on the government. In simple terms, American culture values independence and individuality, which is shown in TV shows like *What Not to Wear*, *Extreme Makeover*, *Queer Eye for the Straight Guy*, and *How to Look Good Naked*. However, the way the media shows poverty has changed over the years. In the 1980s and early 1990s, it was seen as a battle against the poor. But in the later 1990s and early 2000s, there was more focus on helping the poor change their situation. The media talked a lot about Hurricane Katrina in 2005. They saw how many poor people in the US were affected and they criticized the government for not helping them enough. The news stories mainly talked about the difficulties faced by people and communities in a natural disaster, but they didn't explain why poverty happens in the first place. Deborah Belle thinks that even though the media briefly focused on poverty, it didn't really change people's views on poverty and how to help those in need [11], [12].

America believes more in inequality and thinks that how hard you work determines how much money you make, when compared to similar societies. Americans also have strong opinions about people who receive welfare. American media has also contributed to these attitudes, which are encouraged by America's political culture. For many years, American media have encouraged negative feelings towards poor people by connecting poverty to black individuals, crime, and an abnormal way of living. The American media have not been good at explaining why people are poor. This has led many people to think that being poor is the person's own fault. Basically, people who believe in doing things on their own and making money for themselves get support from things like virtual reality and TV shows that talk about taking care of yourself. They criticize people who don't take responsibility for their own lives. This way of thinking makes it hard for the government to come up with a plan to help poor people for a long time.

Politics controlled by money

Hallin and Mancini also didn't talk about how money affects American politics and how the media helps keep this system going. So, they are saying that in the US, companies try to influence political decisions that affect them by lobbying and giving money to political campaigns. They also say that the United States lets television political advertising happen without much regulation. However, they do not realize the link between these two things and the harmful effects that come from it. There has been a big increase in money spent on trying to convince voters in the US. From 1980 to 2000, the amount of money spent on congressional campaigns more than doubled when adjusting for inflation. By 2008, more than \$5.3 billion was used in federal election competitions. This rise was caused by more money being spent on political ads on TV, as well as on campaign consultants, PR, fundraising, election research, and political marketing.

However, political ads on TV still cost the most money during campaigns. It makes up more than half of the money spent on election campaigns, and even more in races that are very close. This shows how clever political ads can change what people think about candidates and who

they vote for. Television ads can be very effective for people who aren't very interested in the election. American political ads are really mean compared to other countries. They are good at making ads that attack and make opponents look bad. Political commercials on TV are really important for politicians and they cost a lot of money. They play a big role in election campaigns in the US.

This really changes how American politics works. To become a Congress member or to win a party nomination, a candidate needs to collect a lot of money. In 2008, it cost about \$1.4 million to win a House race and about \$8.5 million to win a Senate seat. In 2000, no one who tried to win a seat in the House spent less than \$850,000. This means that people running for Congress need to ask rich business owners and wealthy individuals for money if they want to have a chance of winning, unless they are very wealthy themselves. In 2000, almost 80% of the money given to people running for Congress came from Political Action Committees, large contributions of \$200 or more, and the personal money of rich candidates. Business groups gave the most money to PACs for campaigns, about eleven times more than trade unions. Businesses have much more power than public-interest groups. In 1996, big companies that make energy gave a lot more money to politicians than environmental groups did. People who give money to support political campaigns usually come from rich families. In the 2000 election, 81% of donations came from families that made \$100,000 or more each year.

This means that national politicians from either party are controlled by the wealthy and powerful in order to win elections. They also have to keep pleasing others because they need to get money for their campaign to be elected again. Case studies prove that when companies give money to political campaigns, especially at the state level, it can affect how laws are made and what rules are enforced. Also, big business groups give a lot of money to convince lawmakers and influential people in Washington to support their interests. Paying for influence is made stronger by the frequent movement of people between government jobs and working for big companies. This is now a normal part of American politics. Business power makes the American government lean towards low taxes for companies, less help for people who need it, and policies that help businesses.

Spending a lot of money on campaigns makes the political system less responsive. It means that only the Democrat and Republican parties have a chance to win in American politics because it's too expensive for other parties to compete. This is made worse by the way elections are set up. The high cost to enter elections can also make it hard for other people to compete. People already in office have the advantage of getting a lot of money for their election campaigns. This makes it hard for them to lose because in American politics, the candidates who spend the most money usually win. Some politicians in America win their elections without any competition, while others with more money easily defeat their opponents. Abramowitz and his colleagues discovered that there has been a long-term decrease in competition for House elections from 1946 to 2004. They believe this is because campaign costs have gone up, incumbents have an advantage, and districts have become more polarized. In 2008, 94 out of 100 House members were re-elected.

Efforts have been made to control how money is used in election campaigns since 1971, and there were big changes after the Enron scandal. These rules are made to control how much money people can give, how much they can spend, and how much money the government will give to support it. The reformers' plans were mostly stopped by the increase in corporate PACs in the 1970s, the large donations in 1996, and the growth of big donor groups in the 2000s. A government held up by donations from big businesses and rich people continued to rely on their support to stay alive.

Some people want to use the Internet to counter the power of big companies. They want the internet to replace TV ads as the main way to campaign. They also want to use volunteers from the internet to save money, and they want regular people to donate small amounts of money instead of big companies and wealthy people. These hopes were seen in how well Barack Obama used the Internet to win the 2008 presidential election. But Obama just used the Internet in addition to the usual ways of campaigning. He received a lot of money from big companies and also got money from regular people. His team used \$235.9 million to put ads on TV. He hired experts to help with his campaign and won the Marketer of the Year award in 2008. And the total amount of money spent on the 2008 federal elections was \$1.1 billion more than the amount spent in 2004.

In the United States, money plays a big role in politics because the country has not put rules in place to limit the influence of money on elections. So, in a study of 28 countries, America was the only one that did not put a restriction on how much money can be spent on political ads on TV. On the other hand, every other country in the study had some rules in place. In some places, political ads are not allowed. In other places, they can't be shown on public TV or radio. And in some places, political parties get free airtime based on how many votes they get. In many parts of Western Europe, political parties are given free time on TV and radio to advertise. Kaid and Holtz-Bacha say that there's a big difference between the amounts of time candidates get on TV in different election systems. For example, in the US 2004 election, presidential candidates bought about 300 advertising spots, which is a lot more than in other countries where candidates might only get three to ten election broadcasts. Many countries with democracy have stronger limits on giving money to political causes and how much can be spent on campaigns than the US.

This will show how the US and Britain are different, even though Hallin and Mancini think they have similar political systems. In Britain, political advertising on TV is not allowed. There are only a few free party-political broadcasts, and they are not very important anymore. Candidates running for parliament can only spend a certain amount of money in their campaigns. Before 2000, there were no limits on how much money political parties could spend. This makes a big difference in how much money each country spends on campaigns. Gerald Sussman says that in 1997, candidates for Parliament in Britain were not allowed to spend more than \$13,000. In the US the year before, candidates for the House of Representatives spent an average of almost \$1.1 million. He also thinks that the UK spent \$60 million on their 2001 elections while the US spent \$4 billion in 2000. The difference in the size of the two countries is only one reason for this big difference. The amount of money spent on Michael Bloomberg's campaign for mayor in New York in 2001 was more than the amount spent on the national election campaign in Britain in the same year. A closer look at the mayor elections in New York and London in 2001, taking into account the difference in population. Bloomberg spent a lot of money, \$92.60 for each vote, to become the mayor of New York. Ken Livingstone only spent 80 cents for each vote to become the mayor of London. American and British politics are similar in some ways, but they also have important differences. One difference is that Britain's politicians are not as controlled by business and rich donors as the politicians in the United States. Yes, trade unions still give more than half of the money to the Labor Party, one of the two main political parties in Britain.

CONCLUSION

It talks about how there are a lot of political ads paid for by big companies and rich people, and how this affects how people talk about politics and how elections work. In addition, the paper looks at how the American media could change. It thinks about new things like using the internet to make a difference and finding different ways to get money. It shows how important

it is for there to be clear rules and responsibility in politics to reduce the impact of money and deal with media bias. In summary, this paper shows that the media keeps economic differences going and suggests making changes to make things more fair, just, and democratic. It shows how important it is for people to understand and get involved in their communities to make real changes in society.

REFERENCES:

- [1] G. Pasquino, "The Disappearance of Political Cultures in Italy," *South Eur. Soc. Polit.*, 2018.
- [2] P. Wilkin, "The Rise of 'Illiberal' Democracy: The Orbánization of Hungarian Political Culture," *J. World-Systems Res.*, 2018.
- [3] M. Feldmann and H. Mazepus, "State-society relations and the sources of support for the Putin regime: bridging political culture and social contract theory," *East Eur. Polit.*, 2018.
- [4] A. Faidi, "Sistem Kekhalifahan dan Konstruksi Budaya Politik Arab," *Al-Ihkam J. Huk. dan Pranata Sos.*, 2018.
- [5] P. Oana, Andreea Ghita, "Security Perceived As A Cultural Concept: The American Political Culture," *Def. Resour. Manag.*, 2018.
- [6] A. M. Fauzi, A. Sudrajat, A. Affandi, and A. Raditya, "Maintaining Identity Political Culture in Indonesia," in *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*, 2018.
- [7] A. Mohammad Haji-Yousefi, "Political Culture and Iran's Foreign Policy: A Comparative Study of Iran's Foreign Policy during Ahmadinejad and Rouhani," *World Sociopolitical Stud.*, 2018.
- [8] T. N. Clark, V. Hoffmann-Martinot, and M. Gromala, *The new political culture*. 2018.
- [9] O. Senu and F. Daranijoh, "African school of thought: The missing ideology in finding a solution to sub-Saharan African insecurity," *Dev. Policy Rev.*, 2018.
- [10] C. Yates, "Reflecting on the study of psychoanalysis, culture and society: The development of a psycho-cultural approach," *Psychoanal. Cult. Soc.*, 2018.
- [11] J. De Hoyos Puente, "Return projects in the Spanish Republican exile's political cultures," *Cult. Hist. Digit. J.*, 2018.
- [12] R. P. S. Motta, "Political culture and dictatorship: A theoretical and historiographic debate," in *Tempo e Argumento*, 2018.

CHAPTER 10

MEDIA SYSTEM, PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE AND DEMOCRACY

Prof Minerva Das, Assistant Professor

Department of General Management, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India

Email Id- minerva_das@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

This paper investigates the intricate relationship between media systems, public knowledge, and democracy. Drawing on a wide range of scholarly literature and empirical evidence, it examines how different media models shape the dissemination of information, the formation of public opinion, and the functioning of democratic governance. The analysis begins by delineating various media systems, including the polarized, pluralistic, and state-dominated models, and their implications for the flow of information within society. It explores the role of media ownership, regulation, and technological advancements in shaping the diversity, accessibility, and reliability of news sources. Furthermore, the paper delves into the impact of media systems on public knowledge and political engagement, highlighting the influence of agenda-setting, framing, and selective exposure on individual perceptions and behavior.

KEYWORDS:

Accountability, Censorship, Diversity, Gatekeeping, Information Dissemination, Media Literacy, Pluralism.

INTRODUCTION

The way news is shown on TV and the way politics works in America. They don't see that America is a powerful and unfair society where money controls politics. They also don't acknowledge how the media system supports its informal rule, allows social inequality, and contributes to its money-driven politics. This will change how we should think about the Liberal Model. Hallin and Mancini say that the US, Canada, Britain and Ireland have a similar way of doing things when it comes to media and politics, called the 'Liberal Model'. However, this is based on a wrong and partial story of America that hides differences between America and other countries in the 'Liberal' group. There are more important differences between the four countries that Hallin and Mancini didn't notice. Accepting the Liberal Model as it is, means not thinking about the fact that the North Atlantic group of four nations is made up of different places with their own political systems and cultures. They also have different types of government, ways of voting, structures, TV systems, and newspaper traditions. If the Liberal Model is shown as a basic picture, it would look like a portrait with mixed-up and disconnected features, like a Cubist painting.

The Liberal Model might act as a central point. But when you try to describe the common features of four countries together, it's not very useful and becomes a confusing idea. A different argument could suggest that the four North Atlantic countries are a 'Neo-Liberal Model' because they have been strongly influenced by market forces. However, the problem with this idea is that the market is more important in the US than in the other three countries. Many other countries have been affected by market forces too. Instead of putting nations into clear groups, we have a wide range that includes many countries. There are also two other groupings that include different nations, like Sweden and Belgium, which have different communities with different languages, religions, and politics but are still considered to belong to the same category [1], [2].

If one issue is about whether Hallin and Mancini's three models are accurate, another problem is that they don't see the similarities between Western European countries. Even though they are different, they also have some things that are the same. This becomes very clear when we compare them to the US. Western European countries are not a superpower. They are countries that use government actions to help reduce unfair differences between people more than the US does. They usually make stricter rules to limit the influence of money on elections. Almost all countries in Europe have agreed to make and enforce laws together. They have media systems that are based on the idea of serving the public, and are controlled by the government. Most Western European countries have public TV and radio channels that are meant to benefit the public. They also have strict regulations for commercial TV channels to ensure they serve the public. They provide financial support for film, TV and press to encourage diversity and create jobs [3], [4].

Another big problem is that Hallin and Mancini don't cover all aspects of globalization very well. They don't pay attention to how governance has changed and is now controlled by many levels, not just the nation. They also don't talk about how people are trying to take back control from global market forces through international agreements and agencies. More and more people are joining global organizations that work together to help people around the world. These theories are supported by the way media is produced, shared, and consumed globally, but there are many myths surrounding this topic. In short, it would be a mistake to blindly copy the new way of thinking without questioning it. It doesn't give the whole picture and is too focused on just one part of the world.

New and creative ideas

These limits make us wonder about Hallin and Mancini's method. In history, people often argue about whether things are similar or different. Hallin and Mancini sometimes simplify things and focus on what's the same. For instance, they don't talk about the Internet in their book, which is surprising because it was published in 2004 when the Internet was very important. But including the Internet, which is used all over the world, would have made it hard to analyze media and politics only from a national point of view. Maybe that's why people didn't notice the internet. Similarly, Hallin and Mancini don't focus much on TV shows and documentaries, even though they are very popular and have political importance. However, dramas and entertainment do not easily fit into Hallin and Mancini's classification of North America and Western Europe into three separate regions, each with a dominant model of media and politics. Just like the Internet, this problem was ignored. Although *Comparing Media Systems* is not perfect and its main argument may not be completely convincing, it is still a great book.

It uses knowledge from different languages and has given new energy to comparing media research. It combines the study of politics and media in a new way, to prevent media research from becoming too focused on one thing. And it provides an interesting and effective way of thinking about how things are different from each other [5], [6].

The main idea is that journalism, media organization, and political systems are all connected. Comparing different media systems also shows that there are differences in how they work in different parts of the world. And they also show how these different trends are becoming less important because of the growing power of the market. This is especially true in the development of a personalized, media-focused, professionally-driven style of politics that borrows techniques from the business world. This book is very important, unlike *Four Theories of the Press*. Before we finish, we will briefly talk about Hallin and Mancini's final conclusion. They say that the Liberal Model is becoming more popular all over the world. This is seen as a good thing because making money from media helps keep it separate from politics. However,

making things commercial has also led to more media being involved in the economy, and that could be bad. The success of the Liberal Model raises important questions about power and democracy that we can't fully answer here.

Some people might think that not having a conclusion is too simple. The market helps the media be more responsive to the public, which is a good thing. However, Hallin and Mancini exaggerate the advantages of commercialization, especially by overemphasizing how it has helped media break free from political influence. As we have observed, American media, which is a major example of a market-based system, has only been somewhat independent from the government when reporting on American military actions in other countries. The American media have sometimes been very closely connected to powerful social groups. Sometimes, American media watches out for and questions people in power, but they can also be harsh towards the poor. Hallin and Mancini don't think that media commercialization has many bad effects. This topic has been studied and talked about a lot in many books and articles. We shouldn't talk about it here, especially since it was already discussed before. Instead, we will focus on one main question that Hallin and Mancini bring up in their overview - whether media commercialization has made political information and discussion better or worse. They think it's impossible to decide for sure based on the evidence we have.

But new information has been found since this decision was made. There is a lot more political information available now because of the Internet and new TV channels that are possible because of new technology. However, most new websites and TV channels do not have many viewers. In lots of places, TV is the main way people get their news. That's why what's on the big TV channels is really important. A new study by Toril Aalberg and her team found that the amount of news and current events on the main TV channels during the busiest time of day in six countries stayed about the same from 1987 to 2007. However, they also discovered big differences in the amount of TV shows during prime time between American and North European television. For instance, British TV channels showed six times as much news and current affairs in the evening compared to American channels. This difference between continents happened because the US focuses more on making money with TV shows while Europe focuses more on providing TV shows as a public service. Aalberg and others. They also found that there are more news and current affairs shows on public TV than on commercial TV in all six countries. Hallin and Mancini are unsure about how commercial businesses affect the sharing of public information, but they are wrong.

DISCUSSION

In many places, the news is focusing more on making money and entertaining people. This happened because of three things that have been happening more since the 1980s: there are more privately owned TV channels, commercial broadcasters don't have to follow as many rules, and public broadcasters have fewer viewers. We want to understand how media becoming more market-driven affects people's ability to stay informed. The democratic process believes that people can make sure elected officials do their job well. In real life, political accountability needs different things like regular elections, strong political parties, and a media system that gives people enough important information about public matters. We want to see how the media, news delivery, and people's knowledge of public issues are linked. We want to see if systems that focus more on making money deliver more entertainment news than serious news, which can make people less informed about important issues [7], [8].

Comparing media systems in different countries

Different countries have different media systems, and we're going to look at four countries to see how their media affects the quality of citizenship. The countries we're looking at have

different types of media systems one focuses on public service, another has a mix of commercial and public service, and the US has a market-based model. We want to see if the way the media is organized affects how well people are informed and how they participate in society. The American model relies on businesses and competition with little involvement from the government. Most of the media in America are owned by private companies, and the public TV stations don't have enough resources and are watched by less than 2% of the audience. The Federal Communications Commission is overseeing commercial broadcasting with fewer strict rules. This means that American media are now more focused on making money by giving people what they want.

However, despite the growing influence of market forces, American journalism still follows a tradition of 'social responsibility'. News should tell people what's happening without taking sides.

In the last few years, satellite and cable TV and online journalism have made people less responsible in how they share news. More news organizations had to compete with each other, so they each had less of the market. This made them lose money, so they had to cut their budgets a lot. As a result, many foreign news offices shut down and there was much less news from other countries after the Cold War ended. News companies are starting to focus more on easy-to-read news stories, like the ones on local TV news shows that mostly talk about crime, disasters and accidents. Overall, the American market model is more complex than it seems at first. The market influences journalism, but there is also a promise to report on social issues. In the past twenty years, news organizations have had to pay more attention to what people want to hear because there are more competitors. People in this society usually don't care about what's happening in other countries, and many people aren't involved in public activities [9], [10].

In contrast to the US system, countries like Finland and Denmark use a public-service model to influence audience behavior through public laws and funding. The main idea is that people need to regularly watch news and shows about politics so they can make smart choices when they vote and keep the government in check. This will give them the power to make a difference. This idea is why public broadcasters get a lot of money from the government. It helps them get a lot of people watching their shows. In Finland, almost half of the people watched the two main public TV channels in 2005, while in Denmark, almost two-thirds of the people watched their equivalent channels in 2006. The reason major commercial TV channels have to show informative programs for the public is to serve the public's interest. This rule is made by groups that make sure rules are followed. The public-service model includes both public and commercial TV and radio.

Britain's media system is a mix of both the pure market and public-service models. Britain's top broadcasting company, the BBC, is the biggest and most well-funded public broadcaster in the world. It has a lot of viewers. In 2006, the BBC's two main channels, along with Channel 4, owned by the public, were watched for 43% of the time in Britain. However, BSkyB, the main satellite broadcaster, was able to grow without many rules. Also, ITV, the main commercial channel on regular TV, was sold to the highest bidder in the 1990s, and its responsibilities to the public were reduced. This change to make commercial television less regulated had big effects, and we are just starting to see some of them now. From 1988 to 1998, ITV's news shows about other countries were reduced by 50%.

By 2005, it had fewer international shows than any other channel. This affected other TV channels, especially Channel 4, which showed almost 1/3 less foreign news in 2005 compared to 2000-1. The BBC also had less serious news. Unlike broadcasting, newspapers in the four

countries have a strong connection because they are not regulated and are mostly run for profit. Newspaper sales have been going down in the US for a few years now. This has led to fewer daily newspapers available. In fact, most American cities only have one daily newspaper left [11], [12].

In Denmark, there are three main newspapers that compete with each other. In Finland, the press system is mainly made up of local newspapers, but there are also national newspapers that compete with each other. The increase in free daily newspapers being given out in cities has made competition even stronger in both countries. The British national newspapers are much more popular than the local ones. This creates a lot of competition between ten national newspapers that directly compete with each other every day. Five of these are for small, rich areas and they need a lot of ads. They focus on public affairs. The other five are for a larger group of people and focus on entertainment. The second group, which makes up more than three-quarters of national newspaper sales, is working harder to get more readers because newspaper sales are going down faster. Overall, the media systems of the four countries are now less different than they used to be. However, there is still a big difference between American television, which aims to meet the needs of consumers, and public-service television in Finland, Denmark, and to some extent, Britain, which focuses more on meeting the needs of informed citizens. The study of media and how it relates to democracy.

Many of our ideas about how the media should work in a democracy come from the 18th and early 19th centuries. Back then, most of the media were very focused on politics. Since then, the media has changed a lot. Most of the stuff made by the media today, like TV shows, video games, social media, movies, music videos, and books, don't talk about important world events. The news media are reporting more soft news and entertainment. Put simply, most of the media we watch and listen to isn't about politics as we know it. If we want to change how the media serves democracy, we need to consider what this means.

There are three common reactions to the increase in media entertainment. The first is to dislike it because it takes away from the important role of the media in democracy, which was a common response in the late 1800s. The second thing is to see entertainment as a different thing from news about politics. This is the opinion of American political communication experts. The third idea is to show where news and entertainment mix together. This brings focus to entertainment that is explicitly about politics, like the TV show *The West Wing*, which is about the people who work in the White House, or Jon Stewart's *Daily Show*, which makes fun of politics. It also mentions that politics is being reported more like entertainment, focusing on scandals and elections instead of actual policies.

None of these answers are good enough to evaluate how well the media supports democracy. First, some people think entertainment is just a way to distract from politics and don't see the political messages in it. Second, some people see entertainment as not connected to politics at all and use that as an excuse to ignore any changes. This is a trick for looking at today's media like old newspapers. It only works if you think media entertainment is not political or important. The third response only looks at media that combines politics and entertainment. All three methods are cautious about a new situation that involves the democratic value of entertainment. One way to understand how entertainment and politics are connected is to look at how they affect our values, beliefs, thoughts, and what is considered normal. There is some overlap between these categories, and they are only presented as a convenient way of showing broad areas of political meaning. Argument about what is important in life

TV shows, movies, and documentaries make people think about the values that are important in politics. This is important because values have become more important in politics nowadays,

and they can make people vote for certain ideas even if it's not the best for them financially. This happens in the US and other countries too. Countries have different values that shape how their politics work. These values affect the decisions they make about public policies and how they distribute resources and rewards. Changes in what people believe are important caused political changes. For example, the idea of focusing on the individual helped neo-liberal governments become more powerful in the late 1900s. When different forms of entertainment promote different values and indirectly ask the audience to pick between them, they are not just for fun. They could be influencing politics.

To show how drama can express different beliefs and support different ideas, we will look at three different examples. The first example is the popular movie *Chocolat*, directed by Lasse Hallström from Sweden, which combines magic and reality. The movie starts with a woman and her daughter moving to a quiet village in France and opening a chocolate shop during Lent. The mayor and the priest want people in the area to stop shopping at the store because it is encouraging them to break their promise to give up certain things for Lent. A fight happens between the shopkeeper and the leaders of the local community, and the shopkeeper eventually wins. Her store, which sells special chocolates and hot cocoa, makes people happy and brings them together. People who come to the store often become friends with the owner's grandmother. A woman who has been hurt by her husband is helped to leave him. An old man gains the confidence to talk to a woman who has lost her husband. An Irish Traveller who has been ignored by others makes friends with people in the area. All of these positive changes show that bad reactions are overcome. The mayor eats a lot of non-Christian chocolate, as a way of showing he has given up, and he changes into a kind and generous person.

CONCLUSION

It talks about the difficulty of dealing with false information and people who only listen to opinions they already agree with, and how this makes it hard for people to make good decisions and have good discussions in a democracy. In addition, the paper looks at how the media keeps powerful people in check, helps people talk about important issues, and brings communities together. It looks at how the media affects elections, policy discussions, and the way the government is held accountable. It stresses the need for journalists to be honest, for people to understand the media, and for the government to be open about what it does. In summary, this paper highlights how important media systems are in keeping democratic values and practices strong. It supports a well-rounded way of making rules and changes for media that focuses on having many different views, being free from outside control, and serving the public. It also protects the right to speak freely, having many different voices, and the interests of the public. We need more teamwork between the media, community groups, and government leaders to deal with the changes and possibilities of new media in the digital age.

REFERENCES:

- [1] K. Szulecki, "Conceptualizing energy democracy," *Env. Polit.*, 2018.
- [2] D. Fuchs and E. Roller, "Conceptualizing and measuring the quality of democracy: The citizens' perspective," *Polit. Gov.*, 2018.
- [3] P. Castaño, "Populism and democracy," *Rev. Int. Sociol.*, 2018.
- [4] P. Nemitz, "Constitutional democracy and technology in the age of artificial intelligence," *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.*, vol. 376, no. 2133, 2018.
- [5] M. Quaranta, "The Meaning of Democracy to Citizens Across European Countries and the Factors Involved," *Soc. Indic. Res.*, 2018.

- [6] A. Hrčková, “Usability and sociability of direct democracy projects based on online groups,” *eJournal eDemocracy Open Gov.*, 2018.
- [7] T. Landman, “Democracy and human rights: Concepts, measures, and relationships,” *Polit. Gov.*, 2018.
- [8] H. G. de Zúñiga, B. Huber, and N. Strauß, “Social media and democracy,” *Prof. la Inf.*, 2018.
- [9] S. E. Skaaning, “Different types of data and the validity of democracy measures,” *Polit. Gov.*, 2018.
- [10] D. J. Hess, “Energy democracy and social movements: A multi-coalition perspective on the politics of sustainability transitions,” *Energy Res. Soc. Sci.*, 2018.
- [11] P. Christmann, “Economic performance, quality of democracy and satisfaction with democracy,” *Elect. Stud.*, 2018.
- [12] J. C. Stephens, M. J. Burke, B. Gibian, E. Jordi, and R. Watts, “Operationalizing Energy Democracy: Challenges and Opportunities in Vermont’s Renewable Energy Transformation,” *Front. Commun.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 11

EXPLORING THE ENTERTAINMENT AND IDENTITY POLITICS

Dr. Pradeep Kumar R, Assistant Professor

Department of General Management, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India

Email Id- dr.pradeepkumar_r@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The intersection of entertainment media and identity politics, focusing on how popular culture both reflects and shapes societal perceptions, identities, and power dynamics. Through a multidisciplinary analysis, it explores the ways in which entertainment content portrays and influences various identity groups, including race, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, and class. The analysis begins by examining the historical context of identity representation in entertainment media, tracing the evolution of stereotypes, tropes, and narratives across different genres and platforms. It explores how dominant cultural norms and power structures have historically shaped depictions of marginalized identities, perpetuating stereotypes and erasing diverse experiences. Furthermore, the paper delves into the contemporary landscape of entertainment and identity politics, highlighting examples of both progress and backlash in representation.

KEYWORDS:

Cultural Representation, Diversity, Identity Formation, Inclusion, Intersectionality, Minority Representation.

INTRODUCTION

Even though the movie is not about politics, it still has a strong political message. It calls the conservative mayor strict and bossy, and the priest as weak and inexperienced. It says "tradition" is unfair to women and people in lower classes, and that Catholicism is mean and dishonest. This is a big attack on the culture that supports right wing parties in Catholic Europe. The movie only shows the negative side of the tradition it criticizes. It mainly portrays the priest and the mayor in a sympathetic light when they admit their mistakes and agree with their opponents' beliefs. This makes the movie a declaration in favor of political views against the church and on the left side, which is common in mainland Europe [1], [2].

However, the film also communicates a political message that is not tied to local references. It promotes liberal and anti-racist beliefs. It is also strongly against the old system where women were expected to always obey men and do all the household chores without complaining. Its main belief is that people should be free to express themselves and act according to their own morals. The people in the movie find happiness and acceptance by standing up against a society that tries to control them and treat them unfairly. This helps them be themselves, be kind to others who are different, and find happiness. So, people are happy that a grandmother chose not to go to a nursing home because she didn't want to be trapped, watched, and told what to do. Instead, she decides to live a full, but shorter life, and she makes friends and finds love that she didn't have before. This turns out to be the best choice for her, even though her daughter wanted her to go to an institution for care. The movie says that being yourself makes you happy, and letting others be themselves makes everything better for everyone [3], [4].

If this movie's ideas are important in European countries, they also have a political history in Britain. In the 1960s, Britain became more accepting of individual freedom and passed laws making divorce, abortion, and adult gay sex legal. It was an important time when towns adopted policies to fight against racism, homophobia, and to support women's rights in the 1980s. These changes continued and became even more liberal during the time when Blair was in charge.

However, the idea of being independent in *Chocolate* can also be seen as traditional. This is shown in the American reality TV show *Random 1*, which Anna McCarthy analyzes in a smart way. In 2005, the Arts and Entertainment network showed a show called *Extreme Makeover*. In the show, a TV host and a social worker help random people who need it and improve their lives. For example, one episode helped a man named Bruce, who had a paralyzed face and had lost a leg when he was a child. He is not drinking right now and needs a lot of help because his fake leg is breaking. The TV social worker starts to help and collects money from people who want to help for a new fake leg. This means that Bruce can now deal with his personal problems and make something good out of his life. He has been given a fresh chance; it's his choice to take advantage of the opportunity made by kind generosity.

The worker on the TV show said that now that Bruce's leg is no longer a problem, he can decide when he wants to start over and live his life again. Bruce agreed and said he feels free now. The show promotes the idea of helping yourself and asks how it can support you in doing so. However, it is not just about changing your appearance, it is also about thinking about how to change yourself. So, Bruce appears to have no home or job, and his life doesn't seem to have improved. The program's message is that he has been told he needs to take responsibility now it's his choice what to do. The idea of working hard to help yourself is also seen in other popular American shows like *Judge Judy*, where people who are struggling are often pressured and made to feel embarrassed. Laurie Ouellette believes that this popular TV show teaches people to be independent and responsible without relying on the government for help or oversight [5], [6].

The TV show *Casualty*, which began in 1986 and was still very popular in 2010, has different values than other popular shows. It focuses on working together and making progress as a group. More patients are shown on *Casualty* than on most hospital TV shows. People from all different backgrounds come to seek help, like a restaurant manager with a missing finger, a sick doctor, a homeless person with fleas, teenagers with homemade piercings, a woman with drugs inside her stomach, a woman who is pregnant by her brother-in-law, a bald man wearing a wig, and a beaten-up prostitute. In the hospital emergency room where the show takes place, the staff takes good care of the patients, especially those who are very sick.

The show suggests that Britain's health care system, which is funded by the government and available to everyone, with priority given to those who need it the most, is the right way to do things. The show doesn't talk about politics, but it's still about politics. Healthcare in Britain is organized by the government to make it seem like it's not influenced by politics. It's meant to show that people are taking care of each other. *Casualty* is a soap opera that has new problems every week. Some workers at the hospital get jealous of each other, argue, have love problems, and struggle at home. Terrible things can happen, like when a politician's son dies in the hallway and a person seeking asylum kills themselves by hanging from the hospital roof. However, the overall message is still that Britain's public health system works well, and the staff in hospitals are motivated by a strong desire to help the public, despite their human imperfections.

This is the main idea of a 2001 episode. It's about a hospital paramedic named Josh Griffiths who quits his job but then comes back to return his equipment. He cannot handle the pain and sadness of the people he sees at work. "I can't keep looking at the things we see," he tells a coworker. "And then I see them again when I close my eyes. But Josh doesn't have any definite plans to do something else, other than wanting to get a life. He doesn't want to go, but he is convinced to go to a car crash because there aren't enough people working. He saw a young woman stuck in her car, and he remembers meeting her before. The doctors know she is dying and can't be saved [7], [8].

DISCUSSION

Entertainment helps people come together, stay connected, and change how they see themselves in society. Politics is about people trying to get things for themselves. But what people believe is best for them can be based on their group and who they feel afraid of, not just their actual situation. Many people have more than one social identity. What's important in politics is which identity they feel is most important out of all their identities. People's social identity can affect who they vote for. In simpler terms, changes in how people see themselves can really affect politics. For instance, in Europe, people are no longer defined by their social class like they used to be during the time of mass industrialization. Instead, people now identify more with their hobbies and what they buy. This has changed the way politics works. Traditional political parties that used to appeal to people based on their class are not as popular anymore. Instead, new social movements that focus on gender, sexuality, and ethnicity are becoming more important. This has caused political parties, especially European ones that are getting smaller, to try to appeal to different kinds of people in order to get more votes. This has also caused a change in their policies.

The media we consume affects how we see ourselves, where we belong, and who we oppose. This is very important in today's politics. This makes the media, style, and fashion important for young people. Subcultural style is like a test lab where people can figure out who they are, fit in with a group they want to be part of, and push away people they don't want to be with, all within certain limits. This can include hidden or obvious politics. In the early 1980s, Dick Hebdige talks about how 'skinheads' in Britain who were young working-class men didn't feel respected and connected to their communities. They created their own style that was a mix of old-fashioned working-class life, and they also emphasized being tough and being British. This helped them feel better about their low social status and the changes happening around them. In this case, the word "style" was linked to upset working-class beliefs. However, the connection between watching media, cultural identity, and underlying politics is not just limited to unique groups or young people.

Many researchers have noticed how certain lifestyle magazines and popular TV shows have promoted the belief that women can control their lives and shape their futures by monitoring themselves, being disciplined, and determining their own paths. They believe that the idea of being independent and having your own identity is creating a new conservative movement that focuses on strong feminine identity. Music that many people like is very important because it shows where someone belongs in a smaller group and can also be used to speak out against things like politics. This can be seen in the lyrics and sound of rap music made by African Americans in the early 1990s that talked about problems in cities and industries. Often, when several things come together like the words, beat, style, singers, people who like it, where it is happening and when it is happening, it can turn a type of music or a song into something that has a political meaning. Cognitive maps are like mental maps that help people understand and remember the places they have been to.

Popular entertainment influences politics in a third way by providing ways for people to understand the world around them. Entertainment shows us different parts of society and helps us to see the whole picture in a way we can't on our own. It also helps us understand how people behave and the power that affects our lives [9], [10]. This conclusion is based on a long tradition of research that focused on how news reporting affects people. For instance, a study showed that when crime and terrorism are reported individually, people tend to blame the individuals involved. However, when crime and terrorism were reported with context, it led to people attributing the causes to society. The impact of this framing effect changed depending on the

topic and was influenced by other factors like political beliefs. Considering how news affects our thinking, it's probable that reading stories over time also shapes how we see the world.

Entertainment that seems real can have big effects on politics. For instance, there are many American movies about the military and security services. They show the bravery and sacrifice of the American armed forces, from *Sands of Iwo Jima* to *Saving Private Ryan*. There are also movies about the Cold War that are science fiction. They used to be very popular and they show scary things like monsters from the ocean, aliens from another planet, or an enemy that can't be seen. These dangers, which were really just symbols for the fear of communism, were usually stopped at the end of the movie with the help of the American military. After the Cold War, the science fiction genre was changed to show the American military as the heroes of the world. In *Armageddon*, two American military shuttles named 'Freedom' and 'Independence' race to stop an asteroid from destroying the earth. They succeed and the crew of 'Freedom' are hailed as heroes. In the movie *Independence Day*, the US military leads the remaining people on earth in fighting against an alien attack. People from around the world pray for the American military to do well and then celebrate its victories with happiness and gratitude [11], [12].

After the 9/11 attacks in 2001, scary aliens were not the only danger - there were also mean terrorists to worry about. The most famous terrorist show is a long-running TV series on Fox. It's about a hero named Jack Bauer who works for the Counter Terrorism Unit. He's tough and never gives up. He stops many dangerous plans from happening, like killing an important political leader, using a nuclear bomb to destroy Los Angeles, spreading a deadly sickness, causing chaos for a terrorist leader, releasing deadly gas in a mall, setting off nuclear bombs in suitcases, and controlling America's energy, water, and air traffic. All the stories show why America needs to always be careful and protect itself from many dangers. It also needs to spend a lot of money on its military and intelligence and be thankful for its brave soldiers. This suggests that America's big military budget is being supported, and the Pentagon is aware of this. It has been helping Hollywood with logistics and technical support for a long time. This is like giving a secret subsidy to American war movies.

However, Hollywood has also made movies that are different from or question the idea of patriotic war films about national security. For a long time, people have made serious movies about war, like *Red Badge of Courage*, *Platoon*, and *Jarhead*. The main messages that come up a lot in their work are that war is really violent and hurts a lot of people, so we should try to avoid it if we can. There are more important movies like *Three Days of the Condor* and the *Bourne* movies. They show bad groups of spies in the CIA. They suggest that a country with democracy needs to control its security forces. So, in *Three Days of the Condor*, the main character becomes a whistleblower and in *The Bourne Ultimatum* there is a news report about a US Senate hearing into CIA abuses. There are also a few other popular movies that criticize imperialism. These movies include *The Quiet American*, *Rendition*, and *Syriana*, which all show the CIA in a negative light and criticize American involvement in other countries. Here, it shows that the American government is using force to stop other countries from spreading the American ideas of freedom and democracy. This is the opposite of what many American movies show.

So, while a lot of American military movies seem to agree with the Pentagon's point of view, there are also movies that are against war, show CIA conspiracies, and are against imperialism. In reality, Hollywood shows a hidden argument about America's government and its security. The different opinions in this debate are not just about regular politics. *Syriana* doesn't agree with Capitol Hill's views on imperialism, and the TV show *24* supports state torture, which is controversial.

Plays can also start conversations and make people talk about important issues. Jack Bauer from the TV show "24" is an example of this. Bauer made torture seem real, like something that was happening in people's own living rooms. Bauer doesn't always follow the rules, but he always saves people's lives. Torture is shown as necessary to stop terrorism and stop a bomb from going off. However, three things caused a lot of talk about using torture by the government. The TV show with Jack Bauer was watched by a lot of people and became something everyone could talk about. Secondly, Bauer started using torture more often and it became a big part of the show in 2005. Thirdly, many people started to see Jack Bauer as a symbol of something real, not just a character in a story. The bad things that happened at Abu Ghraib prison were shown to the public in 2004 and the people responsible were put on trial until 2006. It was commonly believed that the people who did these bad things were mentally ill. But by 2007, people were talking about how the American government was sending people to other countries to be tortured and allowing its own agents to use harsh interrogation methods on suspected terrorists. There was a lot of talk about Jack Bauer in 2007 because people were concerned about his use of torture. Many suspected that even the 'good guys' were using torture in the fight against terrorism.

In 2007, Jack Bauer was mentioned in a TV debate between Republican presidential candidates. One writer even said the debate was like a contest to act like Jack Bauer. Justice Antonin Scalia, who is a member of the Supreme Court and leans towards conservative beliefs, said something that got a lot of attention and was repeated often. Bill Clinton, who used to be the President, said torture is wrong. But he talked about Bauer in a way that people didn't understand. Brigadier General Patrick Finnegan, who is in charge of West Point Military Academy, asked the people making the show to not show torture because it could affect young soldiers in a bad way. Some Protestant religious leaders spoke out against torture, even though others in their community supported it. A funny cartoon showed a boy named Jack Bauer copying his dad and teasing Arab kids at a camp. People found it uncomfortably funny on blogs. The media talked about Bauer and torture all over the country, from the Washington Post to Yahoo. chatrooms Some people said that the TV show 24's popularity meant people supported torture. Others said that the show's ratings dropping showed that people's opinions were changing. But the main topic was a serious talk about three different opinions. One is that it's okay to do anything to achieve a goal. Another is that torture is never okay. And the last one is a cautious approach in the middle.

Jack Bauer sparked a national conversation about torture when the country was unsure about what to think. A survey in April 2009 found that only 25 percent of people said that using torture to get important information from suspected terrorists is never okay. In comparison, 22 out of 100 people said that torture is rarely okay, 34 out of 100 said it is okay sometimes, and 15 out of 100 said it is okay often. Most Americans used to think it was okay to torture people in some situations, but in January 2009, President Obama made a new policy about questioning people that follows the rules of the world.

The media also affects public life by talking about the rules and expectations that guide how people behave in society. Public rules make everyone agree on what is right and wrong to do, and also help to decide what attitudes are okay and not okay. Public rules change and grow over time. They also differ in how strong they are. Laws can be strong because everyone agrees to follow them and they are enforced by the government. But they can also be weak because people don't always follow them and break the rules. Norms can show the clear lines of what is okay, or give people a lot of freedom to choose how they want to behave. Public rules are very important in how we manage our society, even though they can change.

The media punishes or shames people who break the rules. The media can help make rules weaker, stronger or change them. They can discuss rules in public and decide if they should stay the same or be changed. Another way to revise is by symbolically changing how we see and represent people who are different from us. This can help to change the way we view and accept others. We can see this through how portrayals of sexuality and gender have changed over time.

In the past, in Britain, it was against the law to have gay sex and people did not support it. This was shown in movies that often made gay and lesbian people look bad before the 1950s. Gay men were often seen as either funny and silly, or as scary and dangerous. In the 1960s, things started to change in Britain. People became more accepting and open-minded. Films began to show gay characters in a more positive light. And in 1967, laws against gay sex were removed. Attitudes towards gays and lesbians became less hostile over the next thirty years, but they were still seen as different. People in Britain also became more accepting of homosexuality, with fewer people thinking it's always or mostly wrong. In the early 2000s, things became more liberal. Despite the usual negative portrayals, there were also movies and shows that showed gay and lesbian people as normal and every day. The British TV show *Queer as Folk* was groundbreaking because it made being gay seem normal through its story, filming style, and scenes of sex. Less fighting and better news coverage made people want to change the law even more. From 2001 to 2004, same-sex couples were allowed to have legal partnerships, and the age when people can have sex was made the same for everyone.

In the late Victorian era, tradition, religion, biology, social pressure, and male authority all reinforced a common view of gender differences. This meant that it was believed women should stay at home and take care of the family, while men should be the ones to make money and have important jobs outside the home. Gender convention also believed that women were naturally not the same as men. Many people believed that men were naturally passionate, leading, logical and able to take care of themselves, while women were naturally expected to be modest, reliant, emotional and caring.

This traditional way of passing down rules was argued about, changed, and adjusted later on. The women's movement worked together and with the help of feminist newspapers, they were able to make important changes to the law. One of the biggest changes was in 1918 when women over thirty were given the right to vote. New laws were made and slowly changed over time, and this was shown in the news and other media. Thus, during the 1920s and 1930s, popular newspapers supported women's freedom from strict social rules and emphasized the importance of women being physically active as part of a positive change towards modernity. However, even though these newspapers supported gender change, their women's sections still encouraged women to focus on their appearance and traditional roles as housewives and mothers. In the 1950s, the image of an ideal man in young women's magazines changed to focus more on being boyish and gentle, while still being expected to be strong like in the 1920s. This shows how media changes while still supporting what is considered normal.

Starting from the 1970s, women's progress in Britain sped up. This change was also seen in the way women were shown in the media. From 1945 to 1965, women who were independent and did things on their own were often shown in movies as getting punished or having a sad ending. They were also sometimes shown as not being very feminine or not finding happiness. On the other hand, TV shows in the 1980s and later started to have more independent and successful female characters who were also feminine. Shifting ideas about what it means to be male or female were connected to more people rejecting the traditional way of thinking about gender from the Victorian era. In 1989, only 28% of people in Britain thought that men should work and women should stay at home and take care of the family. By 2002, only 17 percent of the

traditionalist minority were left. However, this rejection of the past is unclear, especially when it comes to understanding who does which tasks in the house. The study also discovered that in 2002, 48 percent of people believed that women should stay home with young children, which is lower than the 64 percent who thought this way thirteen years earlier, but still a big number. The way men and women relate to each other has been changing, and this is one reason why the American TV show *Sex and the City* has been so popular in Britain and other places. The show is a made-up story about four women who live like they are very wealthy in Manhattan, even though they don't have the jobs or money to support that lifestyle. The series is seen as showing a new generation's feminism and criticized for going back to an old-fashioned, non-feminist way. Both ideas are incorrect because the series shows a discussion about different ways people think about gender. This argument is continued in four ways. First, the journalist Carrie talks by herself as she writes or thinks about her sex column each week. One of the main ideas that keeps coming up is the conflict between what people expect based on old-fashioned ideas and what life is actually like for her and her friends. A world of movie love stories and fairy-tale princesses is compared to the everyday ups and downs of normal life.

CONCLUSION

Diverse creators, activists, and people who watch shows and movies are important in challenging common stories and pushing for fair and real portrayals of different people. Furthermore, the paper looks at how entertainment media can affect how people see themselves, how they think about themselves, and how they see others. It explores how seeing different types of people in the media can help people to understand and feel for others, as well as coming together. It also recognizes that the media can also keep stereotypes and harmful ideas going. In summary, this paper shows how entertainment media and identity politics have a complicated and many-sided connection. This means we need to think carefully about what we see in the media, have more different types of people making TV shows and movies, and show the stories of people who are often left out, to change the way things are usually told and make sure that everyone has a fair chance. It supports talking, studying, and working to make changes to the way entertainment media affect our identities and society.

REFERENCES:

- [1] K. Brunila and L. M. Rossi, "Identity politics, the ethos of vulnerability, and education," *Educ. Philos. Theory*, 2018.
- [2] A. Kumar, A. Elliott-Cooper, S. Iyer, and D. Gebrial, "An introduction to the special issue on identity politics," *Historical Materialism*. 2018.
- [3] M. Moran, "Identity and identity politics: A cultural-materialist history," *Historical Materialism*. 2018.
- [4] S. Rudwick, "Language, Africanisation, and Identity Politics at a South African University," *J. Lang. Identity Educ.*, 2018.
- [5] T. A. Börzel and T. Risse, "From the euro to the Schengen crises: European integration theories, politicization, and identity politics," *J. Eur. Public Policy*, 2018.
- [6] I. S. Semenenko, "History on the frontline of identity politics," *World Econ. Int. Relations*, 2018.
- [7] N. S. Bernhardt and L. G. Pin, "Engaging with identity politics in Canadian political science," *Canadian Journal of Political Science*. 2018.

- [8] A. Setiarsih and S. Suharno, "Scrutinizing Papua from Nationalism, Identity Politics, and Indonesian National Integration Perspectives," *Polit. Indones. Indones. Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2018.
- [9] F. Fukuyama, "Against identity politics: The new tribalism and the crisis of democracy," *Foreign Affairs*. 2018.
- [10] F. A. Jabar, "The Iraqi Protest Movement: From Identity Politics to Issue Politics," *LSE Middle East Cent. Pap. Ser.*, 2018.
- [11] V. Kumar, "Citizenship, violence and identity politics," *Sociol. Int. J.*, 2018.
- [12] L. Downing, "The body politic: Gender, the right wing and 'identity category violations,'" *French Cult. Stud.*, 2018.

CHAPTER 12

EXPLORING GENDER NORMS, COLLECTIVE IDENTITY, AND DEMOCRATIC ENGAGEMENT IN THE SERIES “SEX AND THE CITY”

Dr. Salma Begum, Assistant Professor
Department of General Management, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School
Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore, Karnataka, India
Email Id- salma.begum@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The portrayal of gender norms, collective identity formation, and their implications for democratic engagement through an analysis of the popular television series "Sex and the City." The analysis begins by deconstructing the characters of Charlotte, Samantha, Carrie, and Miranda, who represent contrasting attitudes towards gender roles, relationships, and career aspirations. The paper highlights how the series stages a normative dialogue through the interactions and life choices of the four friends, showcasing the spectrum of perspectives on femininity, romance, and professional success. It explores how their diverse experiences challenge traditional gender expectations while also reflecting broader societal norms and tensions. Furthermore, the paper examines the ritualistic meetings of the four friends as occasions for sharing experiences and generating contrasting reactions to individual choices, particularly regarding career, marriage, and motherhood. It unpacks the tensions between gender traditionalism and feminist empowerment, as exemplified by Charlotte's defense of her decision to prioritize homemaking.

KEYWORDS:

Empowerment, Feminism, Gender Roles, Media Representation, Sexuality, Social Commentary.

INTRODUCTION

This normative dialogue is kept going in a second way by showing the differences between the four friends in the series. They each have different ideas and hopes. On one side, there is Charlotte, who works at an art gallery and wants a Tiffany engagement ring, to marry someone from a specific background, and to be a happy mother and wife. She keeps looking for a partner. She says, Samantha is the boss of a small public relations company. She is like a confident, free-spirited woman who doesn't believe in eternal love or marriage. She says she is try-sexual, which means she is willing to try anything. In the middle are journalist Carrie, who goes back and forth between wanting a perfect man and being skeptical as a journalist, and Miranda, a lawyer who is focused on her career, doesn't want a child, and sometimes speaks out about feminism. She got fed up with her friends' conversation and exclaimed on one occasion. The four friends meet up in a restaurant, bar, coffee shop, or apartment in almost all 94 episodes to talk to each other. This is another way the dialogue is shown in the show. These meetings are times when people share what's been happening lately or what they want to do in the future. This can cause different reactions from different people. So, when Charlotte says she wants to quit her job at a fancy art gallery to get ready for her first baby, decorate her apartment, and help her husband raise money for his hospital, her friends don't like the idea. In a later phone call, Charlotte argued with one of them. She said that she believes in traditional gender roles and that she should be able to choose what she wants for herself [1], [2].

The fourth way to think about society's views on gender is by seeing how four women react to what happens to them. Charlotte thought she found the perfect husband, a wealthy and

prestigious surgeon. But it turned out he wasn't what she thought and was just like a fake designer bag that looks good on the outside but isn't real. Getting to know her husband better shows that he lacks important qualities. Charlotte's feeling of sadness about her dream is emphasized when she takes a picture with her estranged husband in their apartment that they are about to sell. This picture is for a trendy magazine and it reminds her of the romantic ideas she had for a long time. Although Charlotte still wants to be a homemaker, she becomes more practical and cares less about following social rules. Similarly, independent Samantha feels more vulnerable as she gets older and battles cancer. She decides to live with a young, caring actor for emotional support. Carrie finds the man of her dreams, but realizes from her time alone in Paris that she's happiest when she has both romance and her career. Miranda has a child she didn't expect and ends up with a caring man who stays at home while she works, which is unusual for traditional gender roles. Each woman chooses different ways to be a modern woman [3], [4].

Certainly, the series follows a traditional storyline where the main focus is on women trying to find a partner. In the end, all four women are successful in finding a man, and three of them seem like they could be characters from a romance novel. The four friends in *Sex and the City* are very smart, successful, funny, attractive, friendly, creative, and in tune with their emotions. This is very different from most men they meet. The men seem promising at first but end up being not good enough. They are selfish, not mature emotionally, can't commit, have bad character flaws, or are just too average. This shows that the women in the story are not equal to the men they meet, which changes the usual story formula. The women in *Sex and the City* have a hard time finding a man, rather than men having a hard time finding them. They don't always get rejected, but they usually say no to men who they think are not good enough. And even though they all want to find a man; they actually feel unsure about it. One woman focuses on her job, another woman likes casual sex, and the third woman values her freedom and has a panic attack when she tries on a wedding dress. They are independent women who are looking for new relationships and solutions. So, thinking that the show just goes back to a time when men were in charge and women only wanted to get married, and are only happy if they have a man, is not understanding how complicated it is. The series is an important conversation about how men and women relate to each other, even though it has fairy-tale stories. It talks about the past, present, and future of relationships between men and women [5], [6].

Simply put, entertainment is linked to the democratic life of society in four ways. It gives a place to talk about and discuss important social beliefs that are a big part of today's politics. It helps people define and change who they are in society, which is closely connected to what they want for themselves. It provides different ways of understanding things, which help people talk about them in public. And it helps us understand, make stronger or weaker, and change the rules we follow as a society. We can't keep thinking of entertainment as separate from politics and the media's role in democracy. Globalization is when different countries and people around the world are connected and interact with each other more.

One change that we need to make is to consider the increase of popular entertainment, and another change is to notice the growth of globalization. When the media's job in a democracy was first explained, it was assumed that the media should help the people in the country and in local areas. This is because democracy started in the country and local places, and newspapers were read there. So, thinking about ideas was limited to only the nation. But as time passed in the 1900s, the nation state became less important. The growth of global financial markets and big companies that can move production to different countries made it harder for governments to control their own economies. Countries were being pushed to follow economic policies that were good for businesses around the world, even if their own people didn't want them.

Countries' governments are still very important in many parts of our daily lives. But the power of national governments and the people who vote for them became less important because of deregulated global trade.

The democratic system is changing because there are fewer people involved. Besides the national and local government, there are two new levels that have been added. The first level includes continental or sub continental organizations like the European Union and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations. These organizations help countries work together on political, economic, and environmental issues. The second level includes global agencies like the United Nations, the International Court of Justice, and the World Trade Organization. These organizations are very important on a global scale. The number of global forums, like the G20, is increasing. These forums help governments work together and make agreements. The goal is to have more control over issues like climate change and the global market. Governments can't solve these problems alone, so they need to work together. They also want to create rules about human rights that everyone in the world agrees with. However, the work to make public power stronger in a world after Westphalia is still in progress. The EU doesn't have enough democracy because the European Parliament doesn't have enough power, even though it's directly elected. In the same way, worldwide rules organizations are strongly influenced by the US and other powerful countries, as well as by rich and powerful people. Overall, it's really hard to make things better in the way we govern different levels of society, but there are good reasons to keep trying to make our democracy better [7], [8].

One problem is that there isn't a strong sense of citizenship that matches the idea of 'multilevel governance'. For the past twenty years, the European Commission has tried to create a media system that promotes a sense of belonging to Europe and encourages people to get involved in European politics. They want to create a public that holds European political institutions responsible. But media across Europe are not strong and mostly only reach a small group of people or specific audiences.

The national media has made some small changes, but they have not been very big. Wessler and colleagues discovered that even though major newspapers in various European countries started paying more attention to EU institutions from 1982 onwards, they were not successful in connecting debates and concerns across different European nations. European citizenship is not well supported by the media in each European country, even though it is based on shared culture and involvement in European politics.

Similarly, even though global governance has improved, people around the world don't feel like they belong to a global community. However, some people disagree with this idea. They mention the fast growth of organizations that work worldwide, as shown by more people joining and doing things for global causes, and the increase in international non-profit groups. Some people say that the Internet and satellite TV have connected people all over the world through communication. These different influences are said to have created a new feeling of being connected to the world and led to the creation of a 'global public discussion' that is supposedly creating a new powerful force in the form of 'international public opinion.

However, this positive understanding does not understand how undeveloped the world news media system still is. The number of people who watch international TV news channels in most countries is very low. The Internet is used by more and more people, but they speak different languages. People use the Internet more for fun than for getting news. In 2006-7, only a small number of adults in Britain, Sweden and Norway got their news from the internet, even though many people in those countries used the internet. Television is the main way people get their news in most countries. Even though television uses news from around the world, it mainly

focuses on news from one country and is meant for people in that country. In the next part, we will explain that TV usually shows news about the home country and looks at the world from the home country's point of view. The main news source encourages people to focus on their own country instead of the whole world [9], [10].

The making and watching of plays and music is known all over the world. This might be more important for creating a feeling of being a global citizen than news. So, Hollywood movies are being made and sold to more countries around the world. Their popularity in other countries keeps getting bigger. The selling and buying of TV shows in different countries has increased quickly, and the Internet and MTV have helped make music more global. However, reality TV shows are being adapted to fit the tastes and interests of different countries. MTV used to only play music from one region, but now they are changing to show music from many different areas. Usually, entertainment is made in many different countries like America, Mexico, Brazil, Egypt, India, and China. Each country makes entertainment for people who speak their language.

This project is having trouble because TV mostly focuses on national news. They pay a lot of attention to what's happening in the government, but they don't do as much to make sure international agencies are doing their jobs. They like to talk about issues within our country, but they don't care as much about getting countries to communicate with each other. Most importantly, national TV makes people feel more connected to their own country than to other countries. This makes it hard to create a better way of governing the world. Media democratic theory needs to change to include the way democracy is organized. When press theory was developed in the mid-1800s, people thought of the press as the only way people communicated with their government. For instance, in 1841, Thomas Carlyle called the press the 'Fourth Estate' and did not mention any other groups connecting lawmakers and the people besides the press.

Many people who study journalism, especially in America, still talk about how the government, media, and the public are connected. It is also part of the tradition of objective journalism, which helps to decide how the newspaper should be set up. In this canon, fair news informs people; opinion-based articles create a platform for discussing ideas that influence public opinion; and in some versions, the editorial represents public opinion to government. The tradition of objectivity also believes that the newspaper should not be connected to any groups in order to have fair news, open debates, and loyalty to the general public. This idea is compared to bad journalism, where reporting is biased and media discussions are influenced by predetermined agendas. In the US, journalism is unbiased and fair. This is different from other countries where the media is more biased and tries to control the public's opinions [11], [12].

The problem with this common belief, often taught in American journalism schools, is that it focuses only on individual citizens and ignores the important role of groups in how democracy works today. Political parties are very important in how politics works in most countries. Interest groups, new social movements, and many organizations of ordinary people are also important parts of modern democracy. They keep an eye on leaders who have power, try to change government rules, and speak for different groups of people. "They help regular people make progress on various ideas, beliefs, and solutions by expressing different opinions.

These groups can come from people coming together to embrace their culture, with the help of smaller media outlets. In the US, small gay newspapers and magazines started appearing in the 1940s and 1950s. This was a time when gay people were treated badly and tried to stay hidden. The increase of this press, and of gay theater, dance, books, and clubs, helped to create more confident and supportive gay and lesbian communities in big American cities. These

communities started the gay rights movement after the 1969 Stonewall riots in New York. They worked to change the law and fight against people who don't like gay people. Similarly, smaller media outlets were important in keeping African American communities together during the civil rights era. They also helped develop the identity of working-class people and their political consciousness in 19th century Britain. Minority media can help communities grow and come together to organize politically. New technology is helping to make things easier in both strict and free societies.

This way of thinking about modern democracy, which is influenced by community identities, gives us a new way to think about the media's role. Media representing groups and organizations should be considered just as reliable as news that informs individuals. Simply put, this means that media that have a specific bias, try to explain the news rather than just report it, use experts to support their views, help leaders communicate with their followers, create a sense of identity for a group, point out problems and offer solutions from a specific viewpoint, and promote different perspectives of society are important. They help organizations and communities work together, which is important for democracy. In simple words, partisan journalism helps to encourage people to get involved in politics when they are feeling disconnected from it. It does this by showing support for a particular political party or cause. Activist media wants more people to get involved, which can help balance out the power of big companies and wealthy people in public life.

However, too much idealism in politics can lead to bad results. It can cause people to split into different social groups that care about their own rights and interests, but ignore others. It can help support a government that favors rewarding loyal supporters with special favors. It can also lead to the majority treating a minority unfairly in a way that is approved by the government. We need to put a stop to uncontrolled power that goes beyond what is necessary to make sure judges can do their job fairly and to protect people's rights. We need to find a way to have a public discussion about what is good for everyone, supported by a sense of working together.

We need a media system that helps different social groups and subgroups in the community and tries to bring them together. Thankfully, we don't have to choose between 'American' or 'European' types of journalism. A good media system includes media that supports groups and communities and a public-service television that reaches a wide audience, reports news without bias, and promotes healthy discussions for the benefit of the public. The purpose of the latter is to give unbiased information to people, encourage conversations between different groups, and create a sense of unity in society. One part of the media system should inspire people to work together for the community, while another part should bring different groups and people together. In summary, a fair media system should cater to all groups in society, speak in a way that is understandable to everyone, and support the community, not just individual thoughts. This means understanding that different types of media can help democracy in different ways. There are two important things that need to be taken care of. One is about different ways to look at how democracy works and how the media should be organized based on these views.

Putting aside the idea of direct democracy, which only really works in small groups where everyone takes part, there are four main different views of democracy. These are groups of related thoughts that are not fully sure if they are just describing something or giving advice. However, to make it easier to understand, they will be shown as clear choices connected to different ways of communicating. In one corner, there's the liberal-pluralist view, which sees democracy as a competition between different interests and power centers. Different companies should be able to compete in the media, just like they do in politics. If the media becomes too focused on one perspective or topic, the market can help by offering different options.

According to this belief, the government should not interfere too much with what the media companies say, because it can limit their freedom. The only condition is that the media market must be able to be changed by new media or technology. This view is linked to the idea of a free market approach to journalism that supports advocacy and taking sides. It openly disrespects the boring and pretentious nature of American journalism. In simple terms, this is the belief that supports the way British print journalism works.

In another way of thinking, some people see democracy as a fight between different groups of powerful people trying to get the public's support. The group that gets the most votes from people wins and gets to hold a position in government for a limited time. In this situation, the argument is that most people don't need to follow the news closely because they can't do much to change government decisions. There are many fun and fulfilling activities for people to do instead. We can ask our political representatives or other people to take care of things for us, just like how we call a plumber to fix a broken boiler instead of fixing it ourselves.

Most people just need to read the news quickly. However, the news media still have certain duties. They need to give a short, fair news report, and be prepared to raise an alarm if there is a serious problem that the public needs to know about right away. Furthermore, we need good media that is driven by a strong sense of professional duty, offering smart and thorough news coverage and enabling important discussions between influential people. Basically, this approach makes it okay for America to have a media system where important newspapers like the New York Times have lots of news, but TV networks show news early in the evening so they can have more entertainment shows.

On the other side is the thoughtful way of running a government. It says that democracy should not just be about people voting periodically or special interest groups fighting for power. Instead, it should be about people discussing and deciding together because they feel responsible for their community. The media's main job is to help people make well-informed decisions, not just when they vote, but also in between elections. It should also help people have a lasting impact on society. This idea says that talking about things in public helps us learn and understand different viewpoints. It also helps us find different choices and change our opinions by talking with others. It encourages us to make compromises through logical arguments. The media should give smart news and allow people to talk about it to help everyone think clearly. Its news stories and conversations should make people want to be polite, look for the truth together, and try to understand others' perspectives. It should also work for the good of everyone instead of just thinking about ourselves, and remind people that the government can do things that individuals can't. This idea is connected to media systems, like in Northern Europe, where there are well-supported public TV stations and strict rules for commercial TV.

The fourth corner is taken by extreme democracy. This tradition criticizes liberal pluralism for not paying enough attention to the power of big businesses and for ignoring how some groups in society have a lot more resources than others. It argues that rational-choice theory makes it okay for people to not get involved in public issues and allows inequality to continue. It is skeptical of the tradition of thinking carefully about things, and says that people in charge can use the idea of being fair to ignore what they don't like. Also, trying to agree on everything can hide big disagreements in a sneaky way.

While it includes a variety of ideas, the radical democratic tradition has become known for specific beliefs. It says the media should carefully examine social and economic power, not just the government. It shows how media that supports one political party can get people who are at a disadvantage excited and involved. In its feminist form, it emphasizes the strength of

feelings, personal experiences, and stories as a way to stand up against male-dominated power. In almost all versions, it says the media should give a strong voice to people who are ignored or not treated fairly. This way of thinking usually focuses on how important it is for all people to work together to create media that goes against the mainstream. However, social democratic versions want the government to help by creating public services that support minority groups or providing subsidies for minority voices in markets that are not fair. Countries with social democratic values try to have different types of media to help democracy. Or, countries with divided political beliefs also have media similar to this plan. This idea makes it seem like the four positions are not very similar or have much in common. Baker thinks it's best to combine different viewpoints into a "complex" model of democracy. We have used this way of thinking to try to mix together deliberative and radical democracy, even though they seem very different. So, the media model being discussed says that we should have a main public-service TV sector along with other media that supports certain ideas. This model aims to bring together different ways of thinking within one media system.

Entertaining democracy

The next important thing is to think about all the ways that making media entertainment more valued could affect other things. Here it has been said that TV, movies, and other media help us talk about what's important to us, who we are, and what we think is right and wrong in society. This all helps with our democracy. It is easy to understand how this point can be included in a rational-choice perspective of media and democracy. This tradition believes that people have simple ways of thinking, like choosing a political party, that help them make good decisions in a democracy without needing to know everything about politics. Now we understand that people can join in democratic discussions by enjoying entertainment. However, real-life proof shows that knowing about public matters gives power to the citizen, which goes against the rational-choice approach. In the study by Delli Carpini and Keeter, it shows that in America, people who are well-informed about the issues are more likely to care about them, vote for politicians they agree with, and take part in politics compared to people who are not well-informed.

Delli Carpini and Keeter say that knowing about the world and taking part in it is something people should feel they have to do, not just something they can choose to do. This is especially true if one country causes the death of people in another country. However, many Americans don't know much about why there was a war and fighting in Iraq, which caused the deaths of over 100,000 civilians. In 2006, 41 out of 100 Americans believed that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction or a plan to make them when the US invaded in 2003. 49% more people thought that Iraq played a part in the September 11 attacks or supported al-Qaeda. This is not a surprising result, but it matches with polls from 2003 that showed many people were confused about what caused the Iraq War.

American war movies can help us understand different views about the American military, but they can't replace the information we get from journalism about what the American government is really doing. The American media focuses on entertainment, so it doesn't give a good picture of what's really going on in the world. This means people don't know enough about what their country is doing. A good democracy needs people to be both well-informed and entertained.

Ideas of freedom and the Internet

Many people now believe that the international public sphere is real. It is seen as just as real as the World Trade Organization and the International Criminal Court. All are considered important parts of the new global system.

Most critical theorists mean more than just international civil society when they talk about the 'international public sphere'. They are referring to organized groups trying to have influence on a global scale. Nancy Fraser and other top analysts are talking about a new idea when they mention the international public sphere. It's about how regular people and informal groups are coming together through global connections to talk and share ideas. They say that a new strong group of people from all over the world is starting to have an impact on how power is used, both in government and in businesses.

DISCUSSION

The international public sphere exists because of many global influences. These include international social movements, global markets, migration and tourism, global governance, and advancements in communication. This new thing is important because it is making the world come closer and improving communication and understanding between countries. Satellites, telecommunication networks, and affordable flights make the world feel smaller and save time. News agencies share news worldwide, and global media markets are making people consume the same media. The Internet is helping people from different countries talk to each other.

All of these changes are said to be creating a new way of life in different places. Ways that people talk to each other, the things they talk about, and their ideas and stories are all coming out of the country and creating new ways for people all over the world to come together, share their worries and agree on things. These are the foundations of worldwide public opinion and commonly accepted rules. In short, people say there is an international public sphere. It is believed to be the result of the way people around the world are increasingly connected and share information. It is creating a strong group of people from all over the world.

Wistful projection

Despite its fancy language, this critical thinking doesn't have much to do with the real world. The world public sphere barely exists, and if it does, it's just starting out. This is because talking about important world issues hasn't been done properly worldwide. In many developed countries, the main way people get news is from TV. For example, in Britain, 65% of people said in 2006 that they mainly get news from TV, while only 6% said they use the Internet for news. However, television mainly focuses on news from within the country and local areas, even though it also covers events from distant places. Even in countries like Finland and Denmark that are focused on international issues, most of the news on their main TV channels is about their own country. In the US, even more of the news is about domestic issues. The study also found that foreign TV news tends to focus on areas of the world that are connected to the home nation. This is about how news from other countries is understood differently based on the country's politics, interests, and history. People still see the world through their own country's point of view.

Some people say the Internet is changing things because it goes beyond location and gives access to a lot of public information that everyone can use. However, most people use the Internet for fun, talking with others, and getting help with everyday things, instead of getting news and political information.

The most popular news websites in Britain and the USA are the websites of the biggest news companies. They mainly focus on news from their own countries. The way people in Trinidad express their love for their country can also affect how they interact online. Most people in the world cannot use the Internet.

The amount of people watching the same shows and listening to the same music worldwide is growing, but this is happening more with TV shows and music than with news. Satellite news channels like CNN are not watched by many people in most countries. In fact, the number of viewers is so small that it is hard to know exactly how many there are. Global media convergence is happening, but not everyone is affected in the same way. China and India, the two most populated countries, still rely mostly on their own media. Also, people in different places interpret the same media in different ways because of their own cultural backgrounds. In simple terms, the world is divided and broken in a way that makes it hard to establish global rules and public agreement. EFL is becoming the language of rich and powerful people, but most people don't understand it. More people in the world understand Chinese, not English. Different cultures, values, economic interests, and connections make it hard for the whole world to agree on things. Certainly, research using real-life observations shows that most people tend to focus more on their local area rather than on international matters.

CONCLUSION

The four friends' regular meetings are a way for them to talk about their experiences and how they feel about different life choices. They often have different opinions about gender roles and women's rights. The changing stories and relationships of the characters show how hard it is to grow as a person, find love, and succeed in a busy city. In the end, "Sex and the City" makes people think about how men and women are treated differently, how much control people have over their own lives, and what society expects from them. The show helps people talk about how to be fair to everyone and how to take part in democracy. It also brings up questions about being treated the same regardless of gender, what society says is normal, and how people can be happy in today's world. When people watch "Sex and the City," they are encouraged to think about their own feelings about men and women, dating, and what they want to do for work. By thinking about it, people can learn more about how complicated modern womanhood is and how personal decisions fit into society as a whole.

REFERENCES:

- [1] M. Faraon, "Concept-driven design for democracy: Advancing co-creative media to support citizen participation and democratic engagement," *eJournal eDemocracy Open Gov.*, 2018.
- [2] S. W. Johnson, "Post-conflict reconstruction, microfinance and democratic engagement," *Peace Econ. Peace Sci. Public Policy*, 2018.
- [3] J. A. Marsh and M. Hall, "Challenges and Choices: A Multidistrict Analysis of Statewide Mandated Democratic Engagement," *Am. Educ. Res. J.*, 2018.
- [4] B. R. Fulton and R. L. Wood, "Civil Society Organizations and the Enduring Role of Religion in Promoting Democratic Engagement," *Voluntas*, 2018.
- [5] H. Biseth, J. Madsen, and I. R. Christensen, "Student Teachers Promoting Democratic Engagement Using Social Media in Teaching," *Nord. J. Comp. Int. Educ.*, 2018.
- [6] U. Bergmark and S. Westman, "Student participation within teacher education: emphasising democratic values, engagement and learning for a future profession," *High. Educ. Res. Dev.*, 2018.
- [7] T. Sprague and W. Keith, "Review of Deliberative Pedagogy: Teaching and Learning for Democratic Engagement. Edited by Timothy J. Shaffer, Nicholas V. Longo, Idit Manosevitch, and Maxine S. Thomas. (Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2017)," *J. Deliberative Democr.*, 2018.

- [8] P. Healey, "Creating public value through caring for place," *Policy Polit.*, 2018.
- [9] L. Walsh, R. Black, and H. Prosser, "Young people's perceptions of power and influence as a basis for understanding contemporary citizenship," *J. Youth Stud.*, 2018.
- [10] S. A. Power, "The deprivation-protest paradox: How the perception of unfair economic inequality leads to civic unrest," *Curr. Anthropol.*, 2018.
- [11] A. Just, "Religious engagement and citizen support for democratic accountability in contemporary democracies," *Soc. Sci. Res.*, 2018.
- [12] A. Srivastava, "Smart Villages: Progress of Indian Era – Today's Need," *Int. J. Res. Appl. Sci. Eng. Technol.*, 2018.