

**La producción informativa bajo lupa, 1939-2010. Estado de la cuestión de las principales aportaciones teóricas críticas sobre los procesos de “fabricación” de las noticias y la influencia de los medios de comunicación**

*The informative production under magnifying glass, 1939-2010. State of the question of the main theoretical contributions critical about the processes of "manufacturing" of the news and the influence of the media*

*A produção informativa sob lupa, 1939-2010. Estado da questão das principais contribuições teóricas críticas sobre os processos de "fabricação" das notícias e a influência da mídia*

**Santiago Gallur Santorun**

Universidad Autónoma de Ciudad Juárez, México

[santiago.gallur@uacj.mx](mailto:santiago.gallur@uacj.mx)

## Resumen

**Introducción.** Este artículo ha consistido en el análisis exhaustivo de 160 artículos y libros sobre los medios de comunicación, la producción informativa y las consecuencias sociales de la influencia mediática durante los últimos 80 años. **Objetivo.** El principal **objetivo** de esta investigación fue entender cuál es el posicionamiento teórico de los estudiosos de los medios de comunicación sobre las dinámicas de “fabricación” de noticias y las consecuencias sociales de las mismas. **Método.** Para el desarrollo de este artículo se llevó a cabo una metodología basada en el análisis de contenido de las principales obras de los autores más relevantes que durante los últimos 80 años han estudiado todas las dinámicas relacionadas con la producción informativa y sus factores asociados desde un punto de vista crítico. **Resultados.** El principal resultado obtenido ha sido la construcción de un completo estado de la cuestión formado por 160 artículos y libros sobre las principales consecuencias sociales de diversas relacionadas con la influencia de los medios de comunicación, analizadas durante los últimos 80 años. **Conclusiones.** Esta investigación ha mostrado un panorama heterogéneo de

interpretaciones, reflexiones y análisis sobre los medios durante buena parte del siglo XX y los **primeros** años del XXI, que se han alejado frecuentemente del paradigma tradicional y han mostrado una crítica profunda ante una visión mediática como modelo de negocio más que como profesión que garantiza el derecho de la sociedad a informarse.

**Palabras clave:** Producción informativa, teoría crítica, noticias, medios de comunicación.

### Abstract

**Introduction.** This article consists in a exhaustive analysis of 160 papers and books related to the media, the news and the social consequences of the media for the last 80 years. **Objective.** The main objective of this research was to understand the theoretical positioning of scholars on newsmaking dynamics and its social consequences. **Method.** The methodology consisted on the content analysis of the main researchs of the most relevant authors, whom, for the last 80 years have studied all the dynamics related to newsmaking and their associated factores from a critical perspective. **Results.** The main result was a thorough state of the arte consisting on 160 articles and books related to the main social consequences of the media influence, analyzed for the last 80 years. **Conclusions.** This research has shown a heterogeneous panorama of interpretations, reflections and analysis related to the media for most of the twentieth century and the early years of the 21st, which have often moved away from the traditional paradigm and that have shown a profound critique before a media vision as a business model rather than as a profession that should guarantees the right of society to be informed.

**Keywords:** Newsproduction, critical theory, news, mass media.

### Resumo

Introdução Este artigo consistiu na análise exaustiva de 160 artigos e livros sobre a mídia, a produção de informações e as conseqüências sociais da influência da mídia nos últimos 80 anos. Objetivo O objetivo principal desta pesquisa foi entender o que é o posicionamento teórico dos estudiosos da mídia sobre a dinâmica das notícias "industriais" e suas conseqüências sociais. Método Para o desenvolvimento deste artigo, foi realizada uma metodologia com base na análise de conteúdo das principais obras dos

autores mais relevantes que durante os últimos 80 anos estudaram todas as dinâmicas relacionadas à produção de informação e seus fatores associados de um ponto de visão crítica. Resultados O principal resultado obtido foi a construção de um estado completo da matéria que consiste em 160 artigos e livros sobre as principais conseqüências sociais de vários relacionados à influência da mídia, analisados nos últimos 80 anos. Conclusões Esta pesquisa mostrou um panorama heterogêneo de interpretações, reflexões e análises sobre a mídia durante boa parte do século 20 e os primeiros anos do século XXI, que se afastaram frequentemente do paradigma tradicional e mostraram uma crítica profunda de uma visão de mídia como modelo de em vez de uma profissão que garante o direito da sociedade de se informar.

**Palavras-chave:** produção de informação, teoria crítica, notícias, mídia.

**Fecha Recepción:** Enero 2017

**Fecha Aceptación:** Julio 2017

---

## 1. Introduction

The media have become, in recent years, one of the sectors that have suffered the most changes due to the development of ICTs. However, at the same time it has become very uncritical, characterized by news production dynamics that are increasingly standardized and less heterogeneous, regardless of the type of medium and the country in which that medium is carrying out its activity.

Paradoxically, this homogeneity in the current media landscape contrasts dramatically with the diversity of research, methodologies and theoretical perspectives that have been raised about the media since the 30s of the last century. Thus, the current changing media landscape, due in large part to the development of all types of applied technologies, contrasts with the conservative perspectives of analysis applied in recent years that, although they rescue part of the methodologies developed in previous decades, use them to study novel topics, but without a critical approach in the background.

For all the above, this article aims to offer a thorough review of the main theoretical approaches developed during much of the twentieth century and the first decade of the XXI, which will allow us to understand how the current dynamics of homogeneity in media discourse come paradoxically from the heterogeneity of the of yore.

It is necessary to emphasize that in order for a series of dynamics to be developed in the media today, the succession of a series of media events and changes that have been investigated, analyzed and documented during the last 80 years is necessary. Therefore, below, we offer a brief analysis of the main and most relevant, to reach the current dynamics of information production that are in the late 30s of the last century. And it is that the influence of mass media in society began to be taken into account as something established at the beginning of the 20th century (De Fleur & Ball-Rokeach, 1989). They began to reflect the great social changes of the time, marked by the beginning of a collective consciousness, as well as the first steps from rural to urban societies and all the problems arising, collected by sociologists such as Tönnies, Spencer, Weber, Durkheim and Park (McQuail, 2010), to the point that, in the United States, the Chicago School and the works of Robert Park, GH Mead, Thomas Dewey and other researchers allowed to question the work of the media on aspects related to social integration (Rogers, Dearing & Bregman, 1993).

Years later a theory on communication would be formulated both in the American country and in Europe (Hardt, 1979, 1991). Thus, the twentieth century has been characterized by equal praise and criticism against the media, both for its great benefits and for its harmful social damage, which occurred with every new media outlet, reaching even media based on computer science and telecommunications (Neuman, 1991). Therefore, we can establish that the criticism of public opinion towards the mass media is not necessarily new (Drotner, 1992), since it goes back to the origin of the very concept of mass (Bramson, 1961) and, even, to the various attempts of sweetening it (Williams, 1961, p.289). However, the term ended up describing a new type of social formation typical of modern society, closely linked to the role of the individual as an active consumer for the mass media (Blumer, 1939). Paradoxically, over the years this concept ended up being revised from the theoretical point of view due to the nature of the experience that the audience experiences. (Ang, 1991).

## 2. Methodology

For the development of this article, a methodology was carried out based on the content analysis of the main works of the most relevant authors who during the last 80 years have studied all the dynamics related to the information production and its associated factors from a critical point of view

The main objective of this research is to understand what is the theoretical position of media scholars about the dynamics of "manufacturing" news and the social consequences of them. For this reason, a content analysis has been proposed that aims to review and classify all the theoretical positions in this regard in order to offer a clear picture of how and why news is developed and how these influence social changes. To achieve the above, we have started the development of an analysis sheet that addresses the studies on the subject based on three main characteristics: the year of work, he or the authors thereof, his position regarding the production of information, the rupture or continuity with respect to the previous theoretical dynamics and the social consequences of said practices.

The main hypothesis of which it would split would be the following: Beyond the existing homogenization in the informative production processes developed in the last 80 years, during this same period a series of critical theoretical questions about the process of " manufacture "of the news and its influence on society. These approaches have ranged from the very concept of mass communication to the very dynamics of selecting some events over others, and have resulted in various social changes linked to the mass media.

Once the methodological development of this research has been carried out, the results are not presented quantitatively, since although the theoretical positions of one or the other side may be quantified, their understanding would be limited by a series of percentages and numerical scales that would hardly account for the deep theoretical debate behind this investigation. Therefore, the results are presented below as an extended analysis of the state of the question, since the number of studies studied far exceeds the requirements normally suggested, both for the time period studied (1930-2010) and for the number of investigations addressed (160).

### 3. Results

The controversy accompanied the concept of mass culture (Resenberg & White, 1957) to refer to the whole media that began to develop from that previous idea of the masses. Some theorists compared the same concept with that of high culture (Wilensky, 1964, p.176), while over the years others exculpated the media from the social consequences of the culture derived from them (Bauman, 1972). . It was even pointed out that the problems that a media-based society was presenting derived from the need to adapt to the new possibilities it offered (Benjamin, 1977). The association of popular classes with mass media was becoming more frequent (Bourdieu, 1986), provoking, if possible, a greater social differentiation.

While the media was penetrating deeply into society, a paradigm in research on the mass media began to develop, which, supported by the various notions of masses that were emerging, ended up becoming dominant (Gitlin, 1978; Real, 1989), enjoying both of defenders as detractors (Rogers, 1986; DeFleur & Ball-Rokeach, 1989). Thus, the dominant paradigm was developed by sociology, social psychology and the emerging information sciences, a decade after the end of World War II (Tunstall, 1977). Theorists such as Lasswell formulated the main functions that communication should develop in society for the benefit of citizenship (1948), while others, at the same time, focused on the requirements necessary to achieve a correct transmission of information (Shanon & Weaver , 1949).

All this also led to deep research since 1949 on the effects of mass communication for society (Rogers, 1986, p 86,87, 88). And it has previously been taken as reference a communication model based on the thinking of sociologists such as G.H. Mead, C.H. Cooley and Robert Park, who saw human communication as social and interactive, centered on meanings (Hardt, 1991). In contrast, later on, the use of similes such as the magic bullet or the hypodermic needle began to pose the possibility that power groups would use the mass media for purposes of persuasion and information (DeFleur and Ball-Rokeach, 1989). Once that same idea was rejected (Chafee & Hochheimer, 1982) because of the difficulty of proving any effect linked to the mass media (Klapper, 1960), thus allowing to preserve a positive image of the liberal society, free of the manipulation of some few (Gitlin, 1978).

The alternative paradigm on the mass media suffered various criticisms such as: that corresponded to an ideology not recognized by society (Hall, 1989), the possible influence of the military or commercial sector on the research of the mass media (Mills, 1956), the biased and promising interpretations about the investigations of the effects of the media and the audience (Gitlin, 1978), the dehumanization caused by technological advances (Carey, 1988), which is based on scientific research supported by methods that are too quantitative (Smythe, 1972; Real, 1989) or, even, to stop researching other cultural and humanistic areas (Carey, 1988).

It is necessary to emphasize that an alternative to the dominant paradigm ended up taking place in the so-called Frankfurt School, founded by German emigrants who left for the United States in the thirties and who contributed a different form of the predominant commercial mass culture of the time, based on Socialism and Marxism (Jay, 1973, Hardt, 1991). A short time later, in the 1950s, other theorists began to critically criticize the use of the media during the post-war period in the United States as a way to impose the established order (Mills, 1956, Katz & Lazarsfeld, 1955). Already in the sixties, the critical-social perspective of Marcuse (1964) began to provide a more qualitative method, pointing out other types of subordination existing towards the media and possible alternative lines of research such as culture, discourse or ethnography (Jensen & Jankowski, 1992).

The social and political changes that have taken place in the last 50 years have caused variations in the own theories about the media. Thus, while the thesis of mass society had been exhausted (Neuman, 1991), the weakening of communism with the fall of the Soviet empire seemed to mark a starting point for the posing of a postmodern thought (Gitlin, 1989). Docherty, 1993; Jameson, 1984). Meanwhile, several possible models of communication were developed, which were distinguished from each other by the theoretical approach on which they relied. Thus they emphasize: the model of transmission (who says what, by which channel and with what effect?) (Lasswell, 1948), already at the beginning of the investigations of communication of masses it was tried to surpass (McQuail & Windahl, 1993), being years later completed and perfected (Westley & Maclean, 1957); the ritual or expressive model that focuses on the representation of common beliefs that contribute to social maintenance (Carey, 1975); the advertising model as a way of expressing and attracting attention (Elliot, 1972; Altheide & Snow, 1979, 1991); and the reception model that recognizes that, although

media discourse is subject to a coding process, it is, if possible, more important to decode these messages, a process that is influenced by context (Holub, 1984; Jensen & Resengren, 1990; Hall, 1980). These models are accompanied by new ways of considering communication of information (Mazzoleni, 1986, p.100, Rogers, 1986, Bordewijk & Van Kaam, 1986), as well as deep reflections related to the new open stage thanks to technological development at from the 60s and 70s (Bell, 1973; Dordick & Wang, 1993).

After the various theoretical reflections on the relationship between society and culture (Rosengren, 1981, Clark, 1969), mass communication was perceived as a form of mediation that could be exercised in different ways, attributing different names to it: " Window, mirror; filter or doorman; sign, guide or interpreter; forum or platform, screen or barrier "(McQuail, 2010, pp. 117-119). At the same time that a frame of reference for relations between media and society began to be established (Westley & MacLean, 1957), aspects that questioned various capacities attributed to the mass media were taking hold: "Calling and directing public attention ; Persuade in matters of opinion and beliefs; Influence behavior Structure the definitions of reality; Confer prestige and legitimacy; Inform quickly and extensively "(McQuail, 2010, p.123). Which ends up causing the need to pose possible questions such as the following: "Who controls the media and in whose interests? What is the version of the world that they offer? (...) Does the media promote greater or lesser social equality? "(McQuail, 2010, pp. 123, 124).

Due to the above, social integration began to be a subject of study (McCormak, 1961, Carey, 1969, Janowitz, 1981), as well as the different types and modes of integrative media forms (Hardt, 1979, Allen, 1977, Rogers). , 1993, Blumer, 1969, McComarck, 1961, Pye, 1963), even considering the possibility of social change through mass communication. All this, together with the previously mentioned questions, led to a series of theories about the relationship between media and society, namely:

-Theory of mass society: revolves around the concept of mass (Mills, 1951-1956, Kornhauser, 1959, 1968, Bell, 1961, Bramson, 1961, Giner, 1976, Beniger, 1986, Neuman, 1991, Mills, 1951 Mills, 1951, 1956, Kornhauser, 1968, Elliot, 1982, Granham, 1986, Enzensberger, 1970, Neuman, 1991). This theoretical approach emphasizes: the interdependence of the institutions that hold the power and the link of



the media with the social power; that the media offer a way of seeing the world, a substitute, that ends up becoming a mode of social manipulation; that the mass media are a monopoly that manages to organize people in mass, as well as audiences, consumers, markets or electorates; they are the voice of the authority and those who contribute the valid referents of opinion. If we go further, we could say that it is characterized by: "Large company; Atomized public; Centralized media; Unidirectional transmission; People depend on the media for their identity; Use of media for manipulation and control purposes". (McQuail, 2010, p.130, 131).

- Marxist theory of the media: it ends up converging on the critical political-economic theory (Golding & Murdock, 1991). They emphasize the classic position (Murdock & Golding, 1977, Bagdikian, 1988, Herman and Chomsky, 1988, Downing, 1984), and the neo-Marxist variants (Althusser, 1971, Gramsci, 1971, Marcuse 1964, Hernan and Chomsky, 1988, Downing, 1984). This Marxist theory states that:

The media are property of the bourgeois class; The media operate in favor of the interests of the bourgeois class; The media promote a false awareness of the working class; The media's access to the political opposition is denied (McQuail, 2010, p.134).

- Functionalist theories of the media and society (Merton, 1957) and its conceptual foundations (Wright, 1960, McQuail, 1987, Merton, 1957): within these it is necessary to highlight the so-called social functions of the media ( Laswell, 1948; Wright, 1960; Mendelsohn, 1966), which could be summarized as follows: information, correlation, continuity, entertainment and mobilization (McQuail, 2010). One of the bases of this theory, in which we are presented with a possible link between media and social integration (Breed, 1956, Burns, 1977), is that the mass media express those values prevailing in society, at the same time who speak for her (Gans, 1979; McQuail, 2010). It also highlights the Functionalist Theory of Media Dependence (DeFleur & Ball-Bokeach, 1989), within which we can indicate those factors that make the socially necessary media elements to favor: integration, cooperation, order, control and stability, adaptation to changes, mobilization, management of tension, continuity of culture and values (Janowitz, 1952, Stamm, 1985, McQuail, 2010, p. 139). They also support the values of community and social order (Jackson, 1971, Cox & Morgan, 1973, Murphy, 1976, Fergurson, 1983, Lull, 1992). The advance in the investigations on the audiences

ended up reinforcing the idea of the personal bond with the society and its values, when finding security and tranquility (Katz and others, 1973, Katz & Dayan, 1986).

- Critical political-economic theory: it is based on an empirical analysis of the ownership structure of the media, as well as on the economic interests of owners and administrators (Garnaham, 1979). This theory emphasizes the idea that the economic foundation of the media aims to exclude those voices that have neither the power nor the financial means to make themselves heard (Murdock & Golding, 1977, p.37). In addition, it emphasizes, among many other aspects, the influence that the media have on the behavior of the public (Smythe, 1977). It uses Marxism as a basis but relies on elements of critical analysis that come from sociology, political science and economics (Hirsch & Gordon, 1975, Murdoch & Golging, 1977, Curran, 1986, Bagdikian, 1988, Curran and Seaton, 1988; Ferguson, 1990). It emphasizes the importance and social influence of the following situations: media concentration (Murdock, 1990), the information economy (Melody, 1990), the privatization or liberalization of the public sector of the mass media (McQuail, 1990; Siune & Truetschler, 1992). This theory brought to light a series of issues to be resolved linked to the media, such as: property forms and commercial strategies on cultural property (Golding & Murdock, 1991), the political discourse between economy and state (Graham, 1986). ), the consequences of overcommunication and the growing information inequality between rich and poor (Golding, 1990). Thus, the main characteristics of this theory would be the following:

The logic and economic control are determinants and the media structures tend to concentration; Global media integration grows; Contents and audiences are converted into merchandise; Decrease in diversity; Marginalization of alternative and opposition voices; Public interest is subordinated to private interests in communication (McQuail, 2010, p. 143).

-Theory of the media: this theory indicates that mass communication can become an instrument to achieve economic and social development, as well as national unity in emerging nations (Pye, 1963), as long as there is a will of the population to get ahead (Rogers, 1962, 1976; Rogers & Shoemaker, 1973), with a mentality in favor of modernity (Lerner, 1958). With the same evolution of the concept doubts arose about

the real objectives of this theory (Hamelink, 1983, Schiller, 1989, Tomlinson, 1991), because it did not take into account the social context in which media influence was produced. To the point that some theorists proposed an alternative based on participation and convergence (Rogers, 1976). We must also point out the Toronto School, with the economic historian H. M. Innis, who linked the civilizations of antiquity with their modes of communication and the promotion of a certain social development. Thus, according to Innis (1950, 1951), communication causes the domination of a group or social class that controls the means of production and the distribution of knowledge. The works of McLuhan, (1962, 1964) were also influential in pointing out new consequences of the development of the print medium for humanity. In a similar vein, Gouldner described relevant changes in political history thanks to the development of certain communication technologies (1976). Other voices also emerged that spoke of the convergence of media that would come together as a network (Neuman, 1991).

-The theory of the information society has the following main characteristics: "The predominance of information work; The large volume information flows; The interactivity of relationships; The integration and convergence of activities; Inclination towards globalization; A postmodern culture "(McQuail, 2010, p. 154). It is based on the work of several theorists who pointed out, as previously indicated, the great influence of technological developments in communication such as printing on social changes (Eisenstein, 1978, Innis, 1950, 1951, McLuhan, 1962, 1964). , despite which there is debate (Leiss, 1989, Ferguson, 1992). Rogers, for example, points out that technology is a cause of social change (1986, p.9). Do not forget that the term information society is from the seventies, eighties, (Ito, 1981) and was later developed to others such as post-industrial society (Bell, 1973). At the same time, it was beginning to be perceived with force as information ended up occupying an essential role even within the economic system (Rogers, 1986, Dordick & Wang, 1993, Melody, 1990, pp. 26-27), with an exponential increase in its flow (Van Cuilenburg, 1987) and technologies that allow interconnectivity (Neuman, 1991). This theory also derives from the identification of different stages of development and social influence of technology (Rogers, 1986, Schement & Stout, 1988, Neuman, 1991, Pool, 1983) and logically causes the existence of defenders (Enzensberger, 1979; Jankowoski et al., 1992; Winston, 1986;) and critics (Golding, 1990, Jensen, 1988, Carey, 1988, Beninger,

1986). All this ends up being related to the concept of globalization and the favoring of political and economic internationalization (Frederick, 1992), with obvious consequences on international politics and economic relations. (Hamelink, 1983; Mowlana, 1986; Schiller, 1989).

#### **4. Discussion**

Some of the most critical ideas about the mass media arose from the aforementioned Frankfurt School and critical theory. We speak of the Marxist School of applied social research in Frankfurt and several theorists of that school who emigrated from 1933 to the United States, among which Marx Horkheimer, Theodoro Adorno, Leo Lowenthal, Herbert Marcuse and Walter Benajmin stand out (Jay, 1973). Hardt, 1991). The approaches used by these theorists were quite forceful and not without arguments. Thus, while Marcuse was pouring strong criticism against a society based on mass consumption that had trade, advertising and a false equality created as a central point (1964), Adorno and Horkheimer (1972) attacked mass culture for the creation of false needs and the conversion of people into simple consumers without ideological decision-making capacity, among many other things (Hardt, 1991). The critics did not wait, calling them anti-American (Shils, 1957).

Despite strong criticism, this position of deep questioning of the mass media had deep theoretical foundations that allowed it to acquire some legitimacy. It highlights, for example, the theory of goodification, which argues that objects are used as goods to have some commercial exchange value. If we apply this concept to interpret the logic of advertising, we will see that it fits perfectly (Williamson, 1978), since by converting art or culture into a commercial good it ends up acquiring different values while losing its critical capacity (McQuail, 2010). If we use the term hegemony (Gramsci, 1971), we have to refer to ideas present in a society that uses the established order to legitimized values seem natural and allow a common vision, reminds us very much the real situation in that the media assume an essential role as transmitters of these concepts (Hallin, 1992). So we will have to talk about ideology (Althusser, 1971) and conscious and unconscious domination, which also works from the discourse (Hall, 1982, p. 95).

Already in the seventies, with the well-known School of Birmingham, Stuart Hall speaks of culture as referring to values that are present in groups and social classes based on their relationships and evolution (Gurevitch et al., 1982, pp. 26- 27), and even refers specifically to the power holders when managing various crises of legitimacy and economic failure (Hall et al, 1978). Specifically, Hall (1980) studied the ideology present in media texts and how it was interpreted by the audience, thus being able to propose a coding-decoding model, in which the public obtained a meaning from the media message created by some producers depending on the situation and the interpretation given. He even pointed out three basic forms of possible meanings based on the political sociology of Parkin (1972). With this background scenario, little by little, research was developed on the so-called differential decoding (Morley, 1980), which was nothing more than what the media audience carried out when reading the messages between the lines, regardless of what they did. that they said literally, to the point of reaching the importance of the social and cultural environment to belong to a specific ethnic group or sex, to receive, perceive and interpret the messages of the media (Morley, 1986, 1992).

These ideas led to consider the need to conduct research on how the media are perceived according to sex, within what fit certain feminist cultural studies of the mass media (Van Zoomen, 1991, Long, 1991, Kaplan, 1992). This way they analyzed, among other things, the way in which differences between sexes are expressed (Goffman, 1976), so that feminist perspectives end up opening many new lines of research (Rakow, 1986, Dervin, 1987), to the point of that authors such as Fiske (1987) talk about sexed television and begin research on soap operas (Brown, 1990, Fiske, 1987, Livingstone, 1991, Modleski, 1982), in which they are analyzed from the power roles within the family (Morley, 1986) to the differences between men and women (Williamson, 1978, Ferguson, 1983, Radway, 1984, Ang, 1985), the supposed attraction of women to media messages of patriarchal content (Radway, 1984) or differences between sexes in terms of selection, context of use and its implications (Morley, 1986). All this has come to provoke reactions, warning of the problems of an analysis too based on sex (Ang & Hermes, 1991).

But criticisms of the media have even come from research on people's meanings and ability to interpret (Fiske, 1987, Fiske, 1989, Schwichtenberg, 1992). Thus, sociology began to emphasize that in the field of culture, which is where the media are located, economic capital is the one that commands (Bourdieu, 1986). And while other theorists rejected this idea and continued with the polemic (Fiske, 1987, P. 126, Fiske, 1989), other social critics opposed tendencies that support oppressive forms against society (McGuigan, 1992), since media mercantilism constrains innovation and creativity (Blumler, 1991, 1992), provoking, among other things: "Criticism of the commodification of the media: Low cultural quality, exploitation of the" weakest "consumers, alienating relations, calculated and utilitarian relations , propaganda of consumerism, "bienification" of culture and relations with the audience "(McQuail, 2010, p.179).

All this causes several researchers to develop the concept of media logic (Altheide & Snow, 1979) referring to the capacity of influence that the mass media have for, through even technology (Slack, 1984; Winston, 1986), describe the real world and constitute it for the audience (Altheide and Snow, 1979, 1991) to the point that: "... There is the imperative to carry out the affairs and to stage events in accordance with the needs and habits of the mass media (in terms of schedules and forms) "(McQuail, 2010, p.79). Thus, as of the 60s, the media event was clearly spoken of as something created and staged (Boorstin, 1961; Katz & Dayan, 1986), related to the ways in which the news is usually structured, predictably for certain events. (Altheide, 1985). Here comes the idea of message bias (Hartley, 1992), the sensory experience that makes us experience the message and the way in which we decode it (Barthes, 1967), which may even influence our own perceptions of the messages. contents (Ellis, 1982). This, which has come to be pointed out as a feature of high modernity (Giddens, 1991, pp. 4,5), for other theorists was the creation of new bases for collective thought tending to even configure the beliefs and values of the people (Gerbner, 1967) or the way to provoke the obtaining of identity from systematic messages and widely disseminated by the media (McLuhan, 1964). Mills previously had pointed out that communication influences the image that the human being has of his life (1951), arriving to define his identity or his aspirations (1956).

Despite what may seem, some of the criticisms of the media derive from the tendency towards the globalization of the mass media caused in part by the evolution of

the media industries and their structure, which is clearly visible in the case of television (Varis , 1984, Tunstall, 1977, Mowlana, 1985, Sepstrup, 1989, Wallis & Baran, 1990, Negus, 1993). In this issue there are defenders and critics of the global trend (Ferguson, 1992), who use arguments as disparate as the criticism of the cultural media imperialism of the United States (Schiller, 1969) or the West (Boyd-Barrett, 1977). Thus, national identities (Schlesinger, 1987) began to be perceived as something that was being affected by transnational culture (Thomsen, 1989), even though there was already the awareness that the concept of nation was promoted by political interest ( Anderson, 1983). This cultural imperialism (Tomlinson, 1991) produced by the media ends up eroding the collective identity (Schlesinger, 1987), although some theorists argue that this mediated cultural interaction (transculturalization) can occur differently depending on the reception of consumers (Biltreyst, 1992). In the end, the process of media internationalization assumes that many decisions of a specific country are imposed based on interests of some power (Smith, 1990).

## 5. Conclusions

We live in one of the most homogeneous historical periods in terms of the news content of the media worldwide, as well as the criticism regarding the ways and means in which they carry out their function. Beyond the ideological stance, it seems that different perspectives have disappeared from academic research, more concerned with documenting and studying the novelty of the convergence between media and technology than with studying the social influence that these still generate.

However it was not always so. From the 30s of the twentieth century have developed a myriad of critical theories and perspectives on the media that, although they have not achieved major changes around the dynamics of internal functioning and information production, yes at least they have documented. At the same time, they have been responsible for documenting and pointing out each of the social changes that the media itself was generating due to the different production and "manufacturing" dynamics of reality. These were not only affected and modified by the various technological developments occurred in the last century, but by how society reacted differently to them, causing at the end trends of the most varied and today are completely assumed as normal.

This research shows a heterogeneous panorama of interpretations, reflections and analysis about the media that during the last 80 years have frequently moved away from the traditional paradigm and have shown a deep criticism before a mediatic vision as a business model rather than as a profession that guarantees the right of society to inform itself. This article offers the possibility of coherently supporting the criticism of the media in real historical references beyond the individual ideological approaches. In addition, it makes it possible to coherently separate the current academic position from a certain conformism of the previous historical dynamics that, moved by all the changes experienced during the 20th century, reacted at the same time by applying particular methodologies to the study of specific topics as unusual at the time, as were the studies on information production dynamics.



## 6. Bibliography

- Adorno, T. & Horkheimer, M. (1972). *The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception. En The Dialectic of Enlightenment*. Nueva York, USA: Herder and Herder.
- Allen, I. L. (1977). Social Integration as an Organizing Principle. En G. Gerbner (Comp.), *Mass Media Policies in Changing Cultures* (pp. 235-250.). Nueva York, USA: Wiley.
- Altheide, D. L. & Snow R. P. (1979). *Media Logic*. Berverly Hills, USA: Sage Publications.
- Altheide, D. L. & Snow R. P. (1991). *Media Worlds in the Postjournalism Era*. Nueva York, USA: Adine/de Gruyter.
- Altheide, D. L. (1985). *Media Power*. Berverly Hills, USA: Sage. Publications.
- Althusser, L. (1971). Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses. En L. Althusser (Ed.), *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. Londres, UK: New Left Books.
- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Londres, UK: New Left Books, London.
- Ang I. & Hermes, J. (1991). Gender and/in Media Consumption. En J. Curran & M. Gurevich (comp.), *Media and Society* (pp. 307-328). Londres, UK: Edward Arnold.
- Ang, I. (1985). *Watching "Dallas". Soap Opera and the Melodramatic Imagination*. Londres, UK: Methuen.
- Ang, I. (1991). *Desperately Seeking the Audience*. Londres, UK: Routledge.
- Bagdikian, B. (1988). *The Media Monopoly*. Boston, USA: Beacon Press.
- Barthes, R. (1967). *Elements of Semiology*. London, UK: Jonathan Cape.
- Bauman, Z. (1972). A Note on Mass Culture: On Infrastructure. En McQuail (Ed.), *Sociology of Mass Communication* (pp. 61-74). Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Bell, D. (1961). *The End of Ideology*. Nueva York, USA: Collier Books.
- Bell, D. (1973). *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society*. Nueva York, USA: Basic Books.
- Beniger, J. R. (1986). *The Control Revolution*. Cambridge, USA: Harvard University Press.

- Benjamin, W. (1977). The Work of Art in an Age of Mechanical Reproduction. En J. Curran et al (comps.), *Mass Communication and Society* (pp.384-408). Londres, UK: Edward Arnold. Biltreyst, 1992.
- Blumer, H. (1939). The Mass, the Public and Public Opinion. En A.M. Lee (Ed.), *New Outlines of the Principles of Sociology*. Nueva York, USA: Barnes y Noble.
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic Interaccionism: perspective and method*. Englewood, USA: Prentice-Hall.
- Blumler, J. G. (1991). The New Television Marketplace. En J. Curran & M. Gurevitch, (Ed.), *Mass Media and Society* (pp. 194-215). Londres, UK: Edward Arnold.
- Blumler, J. G. (1992). *Television and the Public Interest*. Londres, UK: Sage Publications.
- Boorstin, D. (1961). *The image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America*. Nueva York, USA: Atheneum.
- Bordewijk, J. L. & Van Kaam, B. (1986). Towards a New Classification of Tele-Information Service. *Intermedia*, 14(1), 16-21.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. Londres, UK: Routledge Classics.
- Boyd-Barrett, O. (1977). Media Imperialism. En M. Gurevitch, J. Curran & J. Woollacott (Eds.), *Mass Communication and Society* (pp. 116-135). Londres, UK: Edward Arnold.
- Bramson, L. (1961). *The Political Context of Sociology*. Princeton, USA: Princeton University Press.
- Breed, W. (1956). Analysing News: Some Questions for Research. *Journalism Quaterly*, 33 (4), 467-477
- Brown, M. E. (Ed.) (1990). *Television and Women's Culture*. Newbury Park, USA: Sage Publications.
- Burns, T. (1977). *The BBC: Public Institution and Private World*. Londres, UK: Macmillan.
- Carey, J. (1969). The Communication Revolution and the Professional Communicator. En P. Halmos (Ed.), *The Sociology of Mass Media Communicators* (pp. 23-38). Keele, UK: University of Keele.
- Carey, J. (1975). A Cultural Approach to Communication. *Communication*, (2), 1-22.
- Carey, J. (1988). *Communication as Culture*. Boston, USA: Unwin Hyman.

- Chafee, S. H. & Hochheimer, J. L. (1982). The Beginnings of Political Communication Research in the US: Origins of the Limited Effects Model. En E. M. Rogers y F. Balle (Eds.), *The Media Revolution in America and Europe* (pp. 263-288). Norwood, USA: Ablex.
- Cox, H. & Morgan, D. (1973). *City Politics and the Press*. Cambridge, USA: Cambridge University Press.
- Clark, T. N. (comp.) (1969). *On Communication and Social Influence*, ensayos completos de Gabriel Tarde. Chicago, USA: Chicago University Press.
- Curran, J. (1986). The Impact of Adversiting on the British Mass Media. En R. Collins y otros (Eds.), *Media, Culture and Society* (pp.309-335). Beverly Hills, USA: Sage Publications.
- Curran, J. & Seaton, J. (1988). *Power without Responsibility*. Londres, Uk: Fontana.
- De Fleur, M.L. & Ball-Rokeach, S. (1989). *Theories of Mass Communication*. Nueva York, USA: Longman.
- Dervin, B. (1987). *The potential contribution of feminist Scholarship to the field of communication*. *Journal of Communication*, 37(4), 107-120.
- Docherty, T. (Comp.) (1993). *Postmodernism: A reader*. Nueva York, USA: Columbia University Press.
- Drotner, K. (1992). Modernity and Media Panics. En M. Skovmand y K. Schroder (Eds.), *Media Cultures* (pp. 42-62). Londres, UK: Routledge. Eisenstein, 1978.
- Elliot, P. (1972). *The Making of a Television Series – A Case Study in the Production of Culture*. Londres, UK: Constable.
- Elliot, P. (1982). Intellectuals, the “Information Society” and the Disappearance of the Public Sphere”. *Media Culture and Society*, 4(3), 243-253.
- Ellis, J. (1982). *Visible Fictions*. Londres, UK: Routledge and Keagan Paul.
- Enzensberger, H. M. (1970). Constituents of a Theory of the Media. *New Left Review*, (64) 13-16.
- Ferguson, M. (1983). *Forever Feminine: Women’s Magazines and the Cult of Feminity*. Londres, UK: Heinemann.
- Ferguson, M. (comp.) (1990). *Public Communication: The New Imperatives*. Londres y Newbury Park, USA: Sage Publications.
- Ferguson, M. (comp.) (1992). The Mythology about Globalization. *European Journal of Communication*, 7(1), 69-93.

- Fiske, J. (1987). *Television culture*. Londres, UK: Methuen.
- Fiske, J. (1989). *Reading the Popular*. Boston, USA: Unwin and Hyman.
- Frederick, H. H. (1992). *Global Communications and International Relations*. Belmont, USA: Wadsworth.
- Gans, H. J. (1979). *Deciding What's News*. Nueva York, USA: Vintage Books.
- Graham, N. (1986). Contribution to a Political Economy of Mass Communication. En R. Collins, P. Schlesinger, J. Curran, P. Scannell & N. Garnham (eds.), *Media Culture and Society: A Critical Reader* (pp. 9-32). Londres, UK: Sage Publications.
- Gerbner, G. (1967). Mass Media and Human Communication Theory. En F.E.X. Dance (comp.), *Human communication Theory* (pp.40-57). Nueva York, USA: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and Self-Identity*. Oxford, UK: Polity Press.
- Giner, S. (1976). *Mass Society*. Londres, UK: Martin Robertson.
- Gitlin, T. (1978). *Media Sociology: The Dominant Paradigm*. *Theory and Society*, 6(2), 205-253.
- Goffman, E. (1976). *Gender Advertisements*. Londres, UK: Macmillan.
- Golding, P. & Murdock, G. (1991). Culture, Communication and Political Economy. En J. Curran y M. Guveritch (comps.), *Mass Media and Society* (pp. 15-32). Londres, UK: Edward Arnold.
- Golding, P. (1990). Political Communication and Citizenship. En M. Ferguson (comp.), *Public Communication: The New Imperatives* (pp. 84-100). Londres y Newbury Park, USA: Sage Publications.
- Gouldner, A. (1976). *The Dialectic of Ideology and Technology*. Londres, UK: Macmillan.
- Graham, N. (1986). Contribution to a Political Economy of Mass Communication. En R. Collins, P. Schlesinger, J. Curran, P. Scannell & N. Garnham (eds.), *Media Culture and Society: A Critical Reader* (pp. 9-32). Londres, UK: Sage Publications.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*. Londres, UK: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Gurevitch, M., Bennet, T., Curran, J. y Woollacott, J. (1982) (comps.). *Culture, Society and the Media*. Londres, UK: Methuen.

- Hall, S., Cake, J., Critcher, C., Jefferson, T. & Robers, B. (1978). *Policing the Crisis*. Londres, UK: Macmillian.
- Hall, S. (1980). Coding and Encoding in the Television Discourse. En S. Hall y otros (comps.), *Culture, Media, Language* (197-208). Londres, UK: Hutchinson.
- Hall, S. (1982). The Rediscovery of Ideology: Return of the Repressed in Media Studies. En M. Gurevitch et al (comps.), *Culture, Society and The Media* (pp.56-90). Londres, UK: Methuen.Hall, 1989.
- Hallin, D. C. (1992). Sound Bite News: TV Coverage of Elections 1968-1988. *Journal of Communication*, 42(2), 5-24.Hamelink, 1983.
- Hardt, H. (1979). *Social Theories of the Press: Early German and American Perspectives*. Beverlly Hills, USA: Sage Publications.
- Hardt, H. (1991). *Critical Communication Studies*. Londres, UK y Nueva York, USA: Routledge
- Hartley, J. (1992). *The Politicis of Pictures*. Londres, UK: Routledge.
- Herman, E. & Chomsky, N. (1988). *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of Mass Media*. Nueva York, USA: Pantheon.
- Hirsch, P. M. & Gordon, D. (1975). *Newspaper Money*. Londres, UK: Hutchinson.
- Holub, R. (1984). *Reception Theory*. Londres, UK: Methuen.
- Innis, H. (1950). *Empire and Communication*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- Innis, H. (1951). *The Bias of Communication*. Toronto, Canada: Oniversity of Toronto Press.
- Ito, Y. (1981). The “Johoka Shakai” Approach to the Study of Communication in Japan. En G. C. Wilhoit y H. de Bock (comps.), *Mass Communication Review Yearbook 2*. (pp. 671). Beverly hills, USA: Sage Publications.
- Jackson, I. (1971). *The Provincial Press and the Community*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- Jameson, F. (1984). Postmodernism or The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism. *New Left Review*, julio-agosto (146), 53-92.
- Jankowoski, N., Prehn, O. y Strappers, J. (comps.) (1992). *The people’s voice*. Londres, UK: John Libby.
- Janowitz, M. (1952). *The Communicaty Press in an Urban Setting*. Glencoe, UK: Free Press.

- Janowitz, M. (1981). Mass Media: Institutional Trends and Their Consequences. En M. Janowitz y P.M. Hirsch (comps.), *Reader in Public Opinion and Mass Communication* (pp. 303-321). Nueva York, USA: Free Press.
- Jay, M. (1973). *The Dialectical Imagination*. Londres, UK: Heinemann.
- Jensen, K. B. & Jankowski, N. (comps.) (1992). *A Handbook of Qualitative Methodologies*. Londres, UK: Routledge.
- Jensen, K. B. & Rosengren, K. E. (1990). Five Traditions on Search of the Audience. *European Journal of Communication*, 5(2), 207-238.
- Jensen, K. B. (1988). News as social source: A qualitative empirical study of the reception of Danish television news. *European Journal of Communication*, 3(3), 275-301.
- Kaplan, E. A. (1992). Feminist Critiques and Television. En R. C. Allen (comp.), *Channels of Discourse Reassembled* (pp. 247-383). Londres, UK: Routledge.
- Katz, E. & Dayan, D. (1986). Contents, Conquests and Coronations: Media Events and Their Heroes. En C. F. Graumann y S. Moscovici (Eds.), *Changing Conceptions of Leadership* (pp.135-144). Nueva York, USA: Springer Verlag New York Inc.
- Katz, E. & Lazarsfeld, P.F. (1955). *Personal Influence*, Glencoe, USA: Free Press.
- Katz, E., Gurevitch, M., y Haas, H. (1973). On the Use of Mass Media for Important Things. *American Sociological Review*, 38(2), 164-181.
- Klapper, J. (1960). *The Effects of Mass Communication*. Nueva York, USA: Free Press.
- Kornhauser, W. (1959). *The Politics of Mass Society*. Nueva York, USA: Free Press.
- Kornhauser, W. (1968). The Theory of Mass Society. En *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, vol. 10 (pp. 58-64). Nueva York, USA: Macmillan and Free Press.
- Lasswell, H. (1948). *The Structure and Function of Communication in Society*. En L. Bryson (comp.), *The Communication of Ideas* (pp.32-51). Nueva York, USA: Harper.Leiss, 1989.
- Lerner, D. (1958). *The Passing of Traditional Society*. Nueva York, USA: Free Press.
- Livingstone, S. (1991). Audience Reception: The Role of the Viewer in Retelling Romantic Drama. En J. Curran y M. Gurevitch (comps.), *Mass Media and Society* (pp.285-306). Londres, UK: Edward Arnold.

- Long, E. (1991). Feminism and Cultural Studies. En R. Avery y D. Eason (comps.), *Cultural Perspectives on Media and Society* (pp. 114-125). Nueva York, USA: Guilford Press.
- Lull, J. (comp.) (1992). *Popular Music and Communication*. En J. Lull (comp.) *Popular Music and Communication* (pp. 1-32). Newbury Park, USA: Sage Publications.
- Marcuse, H. (1964). *One-Dimensional Man*. Londres, UK: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Mazzoleni, G. (1986). Mass Telematics: Facts and Fiction. En D. McQuail y K. Siune (comps.), *New Media Politics* (pp. 100-114). Londres, UK: Sage Publications.
- McCormak, T. (1961). Social Theory and the Mass Media. *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Sciences*, 27(4), 479-489.
- McGuigan, J. (1992). *Cultural Populism*. Londres, UK: Rutledge.
- McLuhan, M. (1962). *The Gutenberg Galaxy*. Toronto, Canadá: Toronto University.
- McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding Media*. Londres, UK: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- McQuail, D. & Windahl, S. (1993). *Communication Models*. Londres, UK: Longman.
- McQuail, D. (1987). The Functions of Communication: A Non Functionalist Overview. En C.R. Berger y S. H. Chafee (comps.), *Handbook of Communication Science* (pp. 327-349). Beverly Hills, USA: Sage Publications.
- McQuail, D. (1990). Caging the Beast: Constructing a Framework for the Analysis of Media Change in West Europe. *European Journal of Communication*, 5(2/3), 313-332.
- McQuail, D. (2010). *Introducción a la teoría de la comunicación de masas*. Madrid, España: Paidós Comunicación. Melody, 1990.
- Melody, W. H. (1990). Communications Policy in the Global Information Economy. En M. F. Ferguson (comp.), *Public Communication: The New Imperatives* (pp.16-39). Newbury Park, USA: Sage Publications. Mendelsohn, 1966.
- Merton, R. K. (1957). Patterns of Influence. En *Social Theory and Social Structure*. Glencoe, USA: Free Press. Mills, 1951.
- Mills, C. W. (1956). *The Power Elite*. Nueva York, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Modleski, T. (1982). *Loving with a Vengeance: Mass-Produced Fantasies for Women*. Londres, UK: Methuen.
- Morley, D. (1980). The "Nationwide" Audience: Structure and Decoding. *BFITV Monographic*, 11. Londres, UK: British Film Institute. Morley, 1986.

- Mowlana, H. (1986). *Global information and the World Economy*. Nueva York, USA: Longman.
- Mowlana, H. (1985). *International Flows of Information*. París, Francia: UNESCO.
- Murdock, G. & Golding, P. (1977). Capitalism, Communication and Class Relations. En J. Curran et al (comps.). *Mass Communication and Society* (pp.13-43). Londres, UK: Edward Arnold.
- Murdock, G. (1990). Redrawing the Map of the Communication Industries. En M. Ferguson (com.), *Public Communication* (pp.1-15). Londres, UK y Newbury, CA: Sage Publications.
- Murphy, D. (1976). *The Silent Watchdog*. Londres, UK: Constable. Negus, 1993.
- Neuman, W.R. (1991). *The Future of the Mass Audience*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Parkin, F. (1972). *Class Inequity and Political Order*. Londres, UK: Paladin.
- Pool, I. de Sola (1983). *Technologies of Freedom*. Cambridge, USA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Pye, L. (1963). *Communications and Political Development*. Princeton, USA: Princeton University Press. Radway, 1984.
- Rakow, L. (1986). Rethinking Gender Research in Communication. *Journal of Communication*, 36(1), 11-26.
- Real, M. (1989). *Supermedia*. Newbury Park, USA: Sage Publications.
- Resenberg, B. & White, D. M. (comps.) (1957). *Mass Culture*. Nueva York, USA: Free Press.
- Rogers, E. M. (1962). *The Diffusion of Innovations*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Rogers, E. M. (1976). Communication and Development: The Passing of a Dominant Paradigm. *Communication Research*, 3(2), 213-240.
- Rogers, E. M. (1986). *Communication Technology*. Nueva York, USA: Free Press.
- Rogers, E. M., Dearing, J. W., & Bregman, D. (1993). The Anatomy of Agenda-Setting Research. *Journal of Communication*, 43(2), pags. 68-84.
- Schement, J. & Stout, D.A. (1988). A Time-Line of Information Innovation. En B.D. Ruben (comp.), *Information and Behaviour*, (pp.395-423). Rutgers, USA: Transaction Books.
- Schiller, H. (1969). *Mass Communication and American Empire*. Nueva York, USA: August M. Kelly.



- Schiller, H. (1989). *Information and the Crisis Economy*. Norwood, USA: Ablex.
- Schlesinger, P. (1987). On National Identity. *Social Science Information*, 25(2), 219-264.
- Schwichtenberg, C. (1992). Music Video. En J. Lull (comp.), *Popular Music and Communication* (pp.116-133). Newbury Park, CA, y Londres, UK: Sage Publications.
- Sepstrup, P. (1989). Research into International TV Flows. *European Journal of Communication*, 4(4), 393-408.
- Shanon, C. & Weaver, W. (comp.) (1949). *The Mathematical Theory of Communication*. Urbana, USA: University of Illinois Press.
- Shils, E. (1957). Daydreams and Nightmares: Reflections on the Criticism of Mass Culture. *Swanee Review*, 65(4), 586-608.
- Siune, K. & Truetschler, W. (1992). *Dynamics of Media Politics*. Newbury Park, USA: Sage Publications.
- Slack, J. D. (1984). *Communication Technology and Society*. Norwood, USA: Ablex.
- Smith, A. D. (1990). Towards s Global Culture. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 7(2/3), 171-191.
- Smythe, D. W. (1972). Some Observations on Communications Theory. En D. McQuail (comp.), *Sociology of Mass Communications* (pp.19-34). Harmondsworth, UK, Penguin.
- Smythe, D. W. (1977). Communications: Blindspot of Western Marxism. *Canadian Journal of Political and Social Theory*, (1), 120-127.
- Stamm, K. R. (1985). *Newspaper Use and Community Ties: Towards a Dynamic Theory*. Norwood, USA: Ablex.
- Thomsen, D. W. (1989). *Cultural Transfer of Electronic Imperialism*. Heidelberg, Alemania: Carl Winteer Universitätsverlag.
- Tomlinson, J. (1991). *Cultural imperialism*. Londres, UK: Pinter.
- Tunstall, J. (1977). *The Media Are American*. Londres, UK: Constable.
- Van Cuilenburg, J. J. (1987). The Information Society: Some Trends and Implications. *European Journal of Communication*, 2(1), 105-121.
- Varis, T. (1984). The International Flow of Televisión Programs. *Journal of Communication*, 34(1), 143-152.

- Westley, B. & MacLean, M. (1957). A Conceptual Model fo Mass Communication Research. *Journalism Quarterly*, 34(1), 31-38.
- Wilensky, H. L. (1964). Mass Society and Mass Culture: Interdependence or Idenpendence? *American Sociological Review*, 29(2), 173-197.
- Williams, R. (1961). *Culture and Society*. Harmondsworth, UK: Penguin.
- Williamson, J. (1978). *Decoding Advertisements*. Londres, UK: Marion Boyars.
- Winston, B. (1986). *Misunderstanding Media*. Cambridge, USA: Harvard University Press.
- Wright, G. H. Von (1960). *Explicación y comprensión*. Madrid, España: Alianza.