# UNDERSTANDING PUBLIC SERVICE MEDIA

**Deepali B Nayak**
**Devi Prabha A**


ALEXIS PRESS
JERSEY CITY, USA

# UNDERSTANDING
# PUBLIC SERVICE MEDIA

# UNDERSTANDING PUBLIC SERVICE MEDIA

Deepali B Nayak

Devi Prabha A

ALEXIS PRESS

ALEXIS PRESS

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



First Published 2022

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

*Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data*

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Understanding Public Service Media by *Deepali B Nayak, Devi Prabha A*

ISBN 978-1-64532-968-8

# CONTENTS

**Chapter 1. Public Service Media in the Networked Society ..... 1**
—Deepali B Nayak

**Chapter 2. Intellectual Context of the Networked Society ..... 7**
*—Rosanto Anto*

**Chapter 3. Several Public Service Broadcasting Successes ..... 13**
*—Mansi Shukla*

**Chapter 4. Analysis of Digital Enclosures ..... 19**
*—Soyonika Gogoi*

**Chapter 5. Determination of Destructive Technologies ..... 26**
*—Neha Gupta*

**Chapter 6. Networks of Optimism and Pessimism ..... 32**
*—Neha Saxena*

**Chapter 7. Public Service Obligations for Social Network Media ..... 39**
*—Devi Prabha A*

**Chapter 8. A Study on Individual Versus Media: Small Versus Large ..... 46**
*—Razina Ahmed*

**Chapter 9. mediatization: Networks of Social Change ..... 53**
*—Shreya*

**Chapter 10. digital Media Culture and Public Service Mediain the Platform Era ..... 60**
*—Mathew Sinu Simon*

**Chapter 11. determination of Digital Media Culture ..... 66**
*—Ummul Waraah*

**Chapter 12. A Brief Study on EBU Members Recommender Systems ..... 72**
*—Aprajita Verma*

# CHAPTER 1

# PUBLIC SERVICE MEDIA IN THE NETWORKED SOCIETY

Deepali B Nayak
Assistant Professor, Department of Law,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id: deepali.nayak@presidencyuniversity.in

**ABSTRACT:**

The function and difficulties of public service media (PSM) in the networked world, where online platforms and digital technology have changed how media is produced and consumed. It investigates the value of PSM in offering the general public top-notch, distinctive, and independent material. The paper examines 2 the networked world has affected PSM, including how audience behaviours, financial paradigms, and distribution channels have changed. Additionally, it covers the challenges and possibilities PSM must overcome to adapt to the networked world. PSM can successfully carry out its goal of serving the public interest in the digital era by having a thorough awareness of the changing media ecosystem.

**KEYWORDS:**

Content Diversity, Digital Technologies, Media Consumption, Media Production, Networked Society, Public Service Media.

## INTRODUCTION

The new media landscape of the twenty-first century places more emphasis on networked communications than mainstream media. Particularly among the facilitators are the global leaders Google, Facebook, and Twitter. According to Manuel Castells (1996), networked media are essential to the growth of a "networked society," with significant economic implications as explained by Yochai Benkler (2006)[1], [2].The nature and affordances available to all people (or not) in a networked society depend critically on the function and position of public service media in the evolving framework. Three fundamentally important variables are related to the uncertainties.

1. PSM is immersed in a mass media mindset and is founded in PSB's broadcasting legacy.
2. PSM lacks the potential and (often) the motivation to "go global," and is instead narrowly focused on domestic media offerings.
3. Commercial media has already been strongly and steadily strengthening its influence in its opposition to the expansion of PSM online.

It is crucial to ponder critically and give this subject significant consideration since the viability of a public service orientation in the media systems of the future is under question.We are discussing the development of media, but not only or even mostly.The networked society concept, which "depicts and promotes a vision of a society that is thoroughly interwoven with information and communication infrastructures, which (re-)shape the practises and structures that constitute all facets of social life," accords the utmost importance to the roles and functions of media The digitization of media, which is marked by audience participation as users rather than solely as receivers and with increased fragmentation due to media availability, is necessary for the notion to be operationalized. People are both more connected and less connected in the networked society, but there is also

a rising danger of a new era of centralization, which might be encouraged by abolishing the net neutrality regulation[3], [4].

The central notion (and goal) of a networked society depends on several interconnections, including those between communities, economy, media sectors, and technology. Due to varied communities of interest that cross conventional borders, the latter is particularly problematic since interconnection is mostly social and somewhat geographic (across cities and countries). The infrastructure of a networked society in practise is provided by a complex yet opaque worldwide arrangement of networks, which is necessary for interconnection.

Due to the high levels of unpredictability and volatility in market structures and communication channels, today's media marketplaces are disturbed. PSM has its roots in the twentieth-century Modernity project, which underlined the value of mass media organisations (Van den Bulck, 2001). The switch from PSB to PSM is a transformative endeavour since it involves a shift in direction and identity rather than just services or service alternatives. This has been the primary issue of relevant research and the defining focus of strategic development in public media organisations since the late 1990s, particularly in Europe[5], [6].

What happens to broadcasting and the evolution of internet services are not the only issues at hand. In all senses of the phrase, the problem is inherently institutional (see Lowe 2010). Will PSM groups continue to be significant as a key node in a network of diverse media organisations for the people in each nation? Graham Murdock (2005) addressed this issue and concentrated on PSM and "the digital commons." In his contribution to this collection, he updates and expands upon his argument. According to Murdock, a few number of international "digital majors" are establishing a virtual oligopoly of internet control, which is concerning for the survival of different public cultures and the information requirements of democracy in practise. Emphasises the significance of the second way the word is used the institution as a basic cultural norm defining a way of life. It is essential to broaden and renew a public service orientation in media to the degree that the equitable development of networked media systems matters.

Our focus extends beyond organisations in and of themselves. The idea of a central body for PSM is in direct opposition to the networked society framework, which is typified by a proliferation of media, extreme connection, and an expected drop in market failure. In this regard, decentralising public service activities across a variety of media and other groups and initiatives may fulfil the maximum degree of public interest demands in a networked society. On the other hand, it is yet completely unknown how to ensure the delivery of essential public services through the media in the absence of a required and responsible institutional provider. It would be difficult, if not impossible, to ensure this if media are entirely commercial in nature. The chapter by Dirk Wauters and Tim Raats, which makes the case that PSM organisations should serve as a centre for fostering cooperative relationships that are fundamental to the sustainability of public services in networked media "ecologies," is key in making this argument.

So in a way, we have two opposing viewpoints. These are handled in different ways by our contributors. Corinne Schweizer and Manuel Puppis provide a thorough comparative analysis of the situation in 17 different European nations. They do not take a side in either argument, but their study offers a complex, empirically supported understanding of PSM in a networked world. Our writers assume a critical position in light of the opposing viewpoints and varied realities that the idea and practise involve. In our opinion, the idea of a "networked society" is sound, yet it has also been overused as a term. According to Mjs, Moe, and Sundet (2014),

buzzwords start out in a specific area before being swiftly accepted as a common reference for a phenomena that is both generally significant and becoming more ambiguous.

The idea of a networked society has its historical origins in ICT research, which has long been marked by idealistic aspirations of a new "information age" in "post-industrial societies". When national initiatives started to refer to the internet as a "information superhighway" in the 1990s, this concept was adopted.When a word becomes popular, it acquires new meanings. The importance is often given a stronger feeling of urgency while being less exact (Mjs, Moe & Sundet 2014). The idea of a "networked society" has become a popular catchphrase for justifying media policy reforms and corporate investment in 'participatory' media.

This media policy priority was highlighted in Europe in 2015 as a need for creating a "digital single market" (European Commission unpub.). The networked society is anticipated to have significant positive effects on people as citizens and to promote brisk economic growth. The latter has mostly benefited the small number of global digital corporations that have reaped massive financial benefits as a result of big data ownership, while the former has no factual support.Buzzword usage is similarly dangerous for PSM. The 'networked society' has emerged as a prominent element of PSM business strategies and policy papers at national and European levels during the last several years, to the point that it is now significant in both legal and scholarly assessments. The European Broadcasting Union (EBU) explicitly supports "connecting to a networked society" for "continuous improvement of trust and return on society" in PSM in its 2014 policy brief titled Vision 2020. There is no doubt that we are dealing with a highly significant yet ambiguous issue[7], [8].

## DISCUSSION

### Networked Society

In order to explain how new information and communication technologies enable the reorganisation of capitalist economies, Manuel Castells developed the network society idea in the late 1990s (1996, 2000, 2004). Several writers have discussed his point of view, with Peter Goodwin going into valuable information. Influential media academics embraced Castells' viewpoint. According to Denis McQuail (2007), the thesis serves as a valuable macro theory for comprehending the following historical development in the relationship between media and society. According to him, this comes after the Global Village (broadcasting), the Guttenberg Galaxy (print), and the Oral Communication phases as proposed by Marshall McLuhan in 1962. According to McQuail (2007), Castells' theories are crucial for comprehending what is novel in the "fourth phase."Castells was less concerned in media than in a new kind of social organisation in which complex networks make up more decentralised, nonhierarchical social formations. But the significance of the media is crucial, as he said:

In a network society, the major social institutions and activities are structured around networks of electronically processed information. Since social networks are among the first forms of social organisation, it is not simply about networks or social networks; rather, it is about social networks that process and manage information and rely on micro-electronic based technology.This is consistent with Arjun Appadurai's multifaceted theory of globalisation, which was released the same year. It rejects the cultural imperialism thesis and suggests a complex array of semi-overlapping, semi-autonomous "scapes" (1996) that jointly control the globalisation process. The underlying process of globalisation drives the growth of scattered yet interconnected networks across international borders.

Hermann Rotermund's chapter focuses on this.Castells views networks as more than just technical infrastructure; they are a crucial component of every aspect of modern civilization. The emergence of a networked society is due to the pervasiveness of networks in politics, economics, and cultures. This is not meant to downplay the importance of digital communications technology or the gathering and processing of information. To put it another way, a networked society as such is not what it is solely due to media, but rather to social processes and arrangements that incorporate media. This underlines the significance of mediatization, which Stig Hjarvard discusses in the chapter as "a holistic perspective on the interdependencies between media and wider culture and societal conditions" that "shifts attention from communicative processes of "mediation" the use of various media for communication to social processes of "mediatization" changes brought about in wider culture and society due to the growing presence and importance of media.

Castells placed digital media and communication technologies squarely at the crossroads, however he gave the social a higher priority than the technical. According to Monge and Contractor, the networked society is a sophisticated communications network that is "created by flows of messages among communicators." This may be seen as a network of hubs and linkages that join networks and enable communication between them, resulting in a never-ending flow of ideas, resources, and cultural exchange.In our opinion, the Networked Society is a phenomena that has been internetified.

Although the internet is the hub of the internet, individuals and communities must contend with a complex constellation of networks that lack transparency and accountability. Political networks, activist networks, cultural networks, business networks, and social networks are connected to public networks, commercial networks, oppositional networks, gated networks, and dark networks in varied degrees of openness, closeness, and concealment. Networks operate both online and offline, in real time and virtual time, and they operate within, outside, and across all types of boundaries.

Benkler analyses these changes from a socioeconomic perspective in the context of globalisation and Castells' theory of capitalism's restructuring. According to Benkler, those who are normally sceptical of commercial mass media for restricting participation and causing bottlenecks that favour affluent oligopolies stand to gain the most from a networked information economy. As a "innovative ecosystem made of public funding, traditional non-profits, and the newly emerging sector of peer production," Benkler praises non-institutional growth. His main areas of interest include non-market participants and, to a lesser but still important extent, non-state actors.

According to him, this development represents a furious, high-stakes "clash between incumbent institutions and emerging social practises" (ibid., 56), or between the entrenched interests of mass media companies and non-institutional forms of mediation. Benkler is quite concerned in the effects of this change on the growth of the public sphere, which is especially important for the growth of PSM as a whole. Although it is questionable how much of his prioritising will ultimately prove accurate, he is absolutely correct in highlighting the critical role that economic development plays in the growth of networked media.

Time is eternal in a globalised, networked world; it simultaneously becomes smaller and more scattered, more intricate and simpler than previously believed.Digital media networks, according to Castells, are typified by a "space of flows" rather of being restricted to a specific area. A person or organization's "position" is not defined by their actual location, but rather by where they are in the network of information flows. Media inherently contextualises the

networked society as a globalised "scape". As a result, key nodes in the networked society are essentially ungoverned by national law or policy.

PSM groups are inextricably entangled in these tendencies, propelled by and battling the same problems that form, impact, and complicate a broad milieu in which media-society interactions are practised. This environment is unknown at this time and is unstable and unpredictable. comprehending the possibilities of future public services requires comprehending the fundamental issue surrounding the function of PSM.

**Public Service Media in A Networked Society**

According to Benkler (2006), the change to a digital media environment represents a transition from the industrial information economy of the mass media age to a networked information economy. Public service broadcasting (PSB), as (primarily) national institutions, was typified by Modernity's goals and traits, which stressed the usefulness of mass media (see Hall 1992; Scannell 1996). Despite being usually grouped together as "European" PSB or PSM, there are notable national variations. North-West Europe has historically been the "heartland" of the classical approach, with many of its institutions, laws, missions, and practises being quite similar. The way PSB was interpreted and implemented there has had a significant impact elsewhere.

In this area, national broadcasting monopolies were established to manage public service broadcasting in centralised institutions with significant government backing. Due to the limited amount of spectrum available, this arrangement was justified in order to provide universal coverage. Advertising was completely prohibited or subject to tight restrictions while funding was obtained via licencing fees on receiving devices. In the High Modernity period of the twentieth century, PSB institutions had a mission to inform, educate, and amuse the Public (with a capital P), aiming to reach a wide public audience. They were eventually also required to accommodate different minority interests[9].

## CONCLUSION

In the networked world, where digital technology and internet platforms have revolutionized media consumption and production, public service media (PSM) is essential. The goal of PSM, to provide the public high-quality, diversified, and independent material, is still very much in force.For PSM, the networked world presents both benefits and difficulties. On the one hand, viewers may now have more engaging and customised experiences with PSM material thanks to digital technology' increased reach and accessibility. PSM may interact directly with viewers through social media, streaming services, and smartphone applications. Additionally, data analytics may be used to better understand audience preferences and adapt content.

**REFERENCES:**

[1] M. Muñoz Saldaña en A. Azurmendi Adarraga, “Public Service Media and Multilevel Governance”, *Public Serv. Media Networked Soc. RIPE@2017*, 2018.

[2] T. Bonini en I. Pais, “Hacking Public Service Media Funding: A Scenario for Rethinking the License Fee as a Form of Civic Crowdfunding”, *JMM Int. J. Media Manag.*, 2017, doi: 10.1080/14241277.2017.1298109.

[3] J. C. Burgelman, “Regulating access in the information society: The need for rethinking public and universal service”, *New Media Soc.*, 2000, doi: 10.1177/14614440022225706.

[4] G. Cardoso, T. Lapa, en B. Di Fátima, “People are the message? Social mobilization and social media in Brazil”, *Int. J. Commun.*, 2016.

[5] S. G. Toma en D. Tohanean, “Green business models: The case of a german automaker”, *Qual. - Access to Success*, 2019.

[6] P. Näkki *et al.*, “Social media for citizen participation report on the somus project”, *VTT Publ.*, 2011.

[7] M. López-Golán, M. Rodríguez-Castro, en F. Campos Freire, “The innovation of European public service media in digital communication and user communities”, *Cuadernos.info*, 2019, doi: 10.7764/cdi.45.1350.

[8] C. Herzog en J. Meese, “Public service media, innovation policy and the ‘crowding out’ problem”, *Commun. Res. Pract.*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/22041451.2021.2013097.

[9] K. Donders, H. Van den Bulck, en T. Raats, “The politics of pleasing: a critical analysis of multistakeholderism in Public Service Media policies in Flanders”, *Media, Cult. Soc.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0163443718782004.

# CHAPTER 2

# INTELLECTUAL CONTEXT OF THE NETWORKED SOCIETY

Rosanto Anto
Assistant Professor, Department of Law,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id: rosanto.anto@presidencyuniversity.in

**ABSTRACT:**

the essential ideas and concepts that support our comprehension of the sociological, cultural, and technical alterations brought about by digital networks, in order to examine the intellectual framework of the networked society. With references to disciplines including communication studies, sociology, and information technology, it analyses the multidisciplinary character of the networked society. The research examines how social interactions, information availability, communication patterns, and power structures are all affected by digital networks. It also looks at the advantages and disadvantages of living in a networked world, including more connectedness, the digital divide, privacy issues, and algorithmic biases. We may address the consequences and potential of the networked society critically by comprehending the intellectual environment.

**KEYWORDS:**

Communication, Digital Networks, Networked Society, Power Structure, Social Relationships.

## INTRODUCTION

The first point made in this chapter is that as the networked society has grown, traditional public service media (PSM) providers have been progressively sidelined. The term "legacy providers" refers to companies that were previously and still are referred to as public service broadcasting (PSB), like the BBC in the United Kingdom, NHK in Japan, RAI in Italy, and others. The phrase "increasingly marginalised" does not imply that their usual audiences are no longer there. In many situations, though, such audiences have fared better than many commentators from the 1980s and 1990s anticipated. These firms haven't either been technologically stagnant or lagging behind advancements. On the other hand, many companies quickly built up a sizable online presence, and the majority of them have successfully experimented with novel delivery methods for their core goods and services[1], [2].

What I'm trying to say is that as the networked society develops, traditional PSM providers are being pushed to the periphery. In comparison to the platform giants and the start-ups that surround them, which are now the key players in the networked society, they have become progressively marginalised. More crucially, they are increasingly absent from discussions addressing what are often seen as the mainstream shortcomings of that network: risks to privacy, the commercialization of data on personal behaviour, market dominance, false news, etc.I provide a number of explanations for why this occurred. I begin by looking at significant, important theoretical discourse threads that have been supporting the network/networked society concept since the mid-1990s. In order to contrast these discourse threads with the conceptual foundation and institutional reality of legacy PSBs engaged in the

mission of turning into PSM, I want to focus on the fundamental facts that define the shifting economic, social, and communications environment that this discourse captures. This chapter draws on past critical examination and debate of this trajectory of growth, which Bardoel and Lowe (2007) identified as the "core challenge" facing the public service enterprise in the media today[3], [4].

To summarise my argument, while the intellectual foundation and institutional reality of legacy PSB organisations were sufficiently strong to enable some to respond surprisingly well to the communication "revolutions" of the late 20th century, especially multi-channel television and the early online environment, much of the environment in which it is being developed systematically excludes people of colour. This consequently poses an apparently insurmountable challenge to their intellectual foundation, which has been institutionally built.I use the word "seemingly" because the chapter's conclusion includes a discussion of the conditions that must be met for legacy PSB providers to rejoin the conversation about PSM in networked societies.

It seems sense to begin our examination of this topic with Castells' book for at least three distinct reasons. First, despite the fact that Castells did not coin the phrase, The Rise of the Network Society had a significant impact in popularising this idea. Second, it may be seen as foresighted given that it was published in 1995, just as the World Wide Web was starting to gain traction. It was published during a period that is now seen as a pivotal turning point in reality rather than just being hypothetical, which may explain why its second edition required substantial revision since things change quickly in this sector. Third, Castells intentionally used a tone of inquiry based on factual facts that generated insightful questions for further thought, as opposed to providing a more usual example of loud advocacy and hype that has contaminated "futurological" contributions on the topic.

The way Castells described the subject of his study, "the emergence of a new social structure [which] is associated with the emergence of a new mode of development, informationalization, historically shaped by the restructuring of the capitalist mode of production towards the end of the twentieth century", demonstrates his nuanced stance on technological determinism with respect to this last point.

The basic thesis is that capitalism has been restructured, giving birth to a new "techno-economic system" that may be summed up as informational capitalism (ibid., 18). The process of capitalist restructuring that has been going on since the 1980s, according to Castells, has been "the most decisive historical factor accelerating, channelling and shaping the information technology paradigm, and inducing its associated social forms" (ibid).

According to Castells, this process began with the "Keynesian model of capitalist growth" crises of the 1970s, which prompted a protracted sequence of institutional and managerial changes aimed at achieving four key objectives:

1. Strengthening the profit-seeking logic of capitalism in capital-labor interactions.
2. Increasing both capital and labour productivity.
3. Globalisation of markets, circulation, and production.

Therefore, according to Castells' argument, the network society is not only about the use of networked information technology (IT), but rather it is the result of the post-Keynesian reorganisation of capitalism, of which IT was an essential but minor component. From this

perspective, it should come as no surprise that existing PSB companies would feel quite out of place in the new environment. After all, as discussed in prior work (Lowe, Goodwin, & Nobuto 2016), PSB was founded as and has remained a collection of publicly owned national entities.Even while some PSB groups were founded before to the Keynesian period, their heyday was from the time of and immediately after World War II through the 1970s. PSB entities were charged with the very specialised task of doing broadcasting, sometimes as a monopoly[5], [6].

It was simple to expand this mandate from radio to television, a more recent medium for transmission.In contrast to the USA, PSB associations had a significant role in the widespread adoption of television throughout Europe. The ideal mass media is television, which became popular during the "Keynesian era." One-to-many communication, a small number of channels and thus constrained options, and the viewpoint of a mass audience are some of its fundamental characteristics. These traits are similar to those that defined the Keynesian period and, as we may observe from a different theoretical vantage point, are also recognised as distinguishing traits of "Fordism" a mass orientation represented in mass markets, manufacturing, etc.

We should also note that Castells and others see the rising globalisation of media production, circulation, and markets as a cornerstone of the new informational society, which has ran opposite to PSB's basically national constitution. Castells did observe that the "new technologies transformed the world of media", despite the fact that few authors on the network society specifically mentioned PSB. That 'universe' in Europe included established PSB organisations. Audiences were fragmented and varied in the 1970s and 1980s thanks to the quick spread of cable, satellite, and VCRs as well as the proliferation of new private commercial channels. One prominent instance was the privatisation of France's TF1, a significant publicly owned channel. In order to carve out market shares in a market that is completely transforming, "investment has poured into the communications field as mega-groups have been formed and strategic alliances have been established". Castells' stance was nuanced in this regard as well: "While the media have indeed become globally interconnected, and programmes and messages circulate in the global network, we are not living in a global village but rather in customised cottages globally produced and locally distributed" (ibid., emphasis in original). It is clear from his nuanced stance on local distribution and worldwide manufacturing that PSB has limited room to grow as a business with a national focus. PSB groups have always been heavily involved in and focused on national production because of their basic constitutions.While there are certain benefits to such, as will be addressed later, it poses a serious challenge for PSB in the globalised ecosystem of media companies, contents, and services that characterises a networked society[7], [8].

## DISCUSSION

### Neo-liberalism and Americanness

It's important to underline yet another component of the complex network society that Castells described. Even though he did not use the word "neo-liberalism," the process of "capitalist restructuring" connects the development of the networked society with the neo-liberal philosophy, which since the 1980s has emerged as the dominant ideology and widely accepted standard in mainstream politics and policy. The victory of Margaret Thatcher in the

UK and Ronald Reagan in the USA between 1978 and 1980 marked a turning point that solidified this supremacy, according to David Harvey (2005: 1), who wrote specifically on neo-liberalism. In the same time frame, Deng Xiaoping began the People's Republic of China's increasingly important economic reforms. We must acknowledge this simple but crucial fact: Neo-liberalism has been the dominant and accepted worldview during the whole time that the network society has grown and flourished. This fact has significant ramifications for PSB's potential roleor lack thereofin the network society.

Generally speaking, PSB has been and still is a collection of publicly owned corporationsexactly the kind of organisational structure that neo-liberalism sought to eliminate, and did so with great success. While neo-liberal policy has actively attempted to limit state engagement on the theory that state assistance generates "unfair" competition that stifles "natural" economic possibilities for private sector, privatisation has been relatively uncommon so far (TF1 being the most noteworthy exception). Because of this, it has been very difficult for PSB companies to diversify beyond a rigid rendition of their "broadcasting remit." In actuality, this implies that PSB is purposefully prevented from completely integrating into the network society. Like all other public institutions (with the possible exception of the military), PSB has experienced growing financial pressure. This is also consistent with neo-liberal doctrine and has complicated the process of expanding growth.

the network society idea and its following advancements' fundamentally "Americanness." It is necessary because public service broadcasting has historically and now (with due apologies to NPR and PBS) played a far smaller role in American media and culture than in other OECD nations. Public broadcasting is not inconsequential in the United States, but it does not have the same political clout or social and cultural sway as, for instance, the BBC in the United Kingdom or the NHK in Japan. It is not surprising that PSB has struggled to find a place in the network society framework given that it was created by, developed by, and discussed primarily within an American sensibility (as Castells, a European, points out). This is true even though the actual network society in practise has engulfed non-American audiences.

**The individual versus media; small versus large**

Regarding how these organisations could regard their integration (or lack thereof) into the network society, two more PSB components are pertinent. The first is that, as was already said, they are and have always been mass media companies. A disdain for mainstream media is a recurrent theme in much of the early discourse about the network society.Being Digital by Nicholas Negroponte, published in 1995, is a noteworthy but common example.He made the infamous prediction that "media barons of today will be grasping to hold on to their centralised empires tomorrow" and that "what will happen to broadcast television over the next five years is so phenomenal that it's difficult to comprehend"

It is simple to make fun of these forecasts now, 22 years later, as Henry Jenkins did. Time Warner and Disney, as well as the media empires founded by Rupert Murdoch and Sumner Redstone as well as the BBC, NHK, ZDF, and other organisations, are all still operating in August 2017. Negroponte made the common error of anticipating that the emergence of a new form of media will replace the old rather than anticipating its coexistence and reflexive development the precise argument Jenkins addresses in his convergence thesis. Although it is now obvious that this was a mistake, the widespread anti-mass media rhetoric of the early

proponents of new media would understandably lead PSB organisations along with their commercial counterparts to worry about their ability to survive in a network society as long as they continued to be fundamentally about broadcasting. Negroponte still addressed a significant point that is quite pertinent in this case despite his bad rhetorical predictions:

Negroponte made a perceptive point about the inefficiency of using the broadcasting-derived concept of "narrowcasting" to think through potential developments in the network society, setting aside the fact that Google and Facebook have since developed massively successful business models using the digital activities of me. For broadcasters and other mass media firms, both commercial and public, that method of exploring network society prospects came most easily. It should thus come as no surprise that the majority of significant new advances in network society media have come from start-ups rather than reputable mainstream media corporations, notwithstanding notable outliers such as iPlayer at the BBC). PSB has never been about mainly satisfying the individual interests of people, but rather on addressing the broad, common often presumptive requirements of society as a whole. Media 1.0 was that. This point of view is ingrained in PSB operations and organisational directives.

This suggests that PSM groups are not well suited to succeed in the setting of the network society. They are not tiny start-ups; in fact, major mass media players often see small start-ups as a significant danger and arguably even a greater threat than established national commercial media businesses. PSB companies, on the other hand, have little to no possibility to gain from global concentration, which is tremendously advantageous to bigger national commercial media businesses.Even if PSB's brand is often a strength at home, it is nevertheless limited to the national market. However, unlike their commercial rivals, they are politically restrained from modernising themselves by purchasing or funding start-ups. Thus, the rhetoric surrounding the network society and much of the reality have been especially unconducive to PSB having a beneficial role from the very beginnings of the network society as a considerable reality since the 1990s.

The creation of digital terrestrial television (DTT) was one of the rare instances when (neo-liberal) governments did briefly toy with the idea of giving PSB groups a constructive role in creating the network society. In the middle of the 1990s, many observers lacked faith that the 'information superhighway' the internet would be adopted by the vast majority of people instead of just a relatively tiny elite of educated and young people. DTT, for instance, was briefly considered an alternative to the information superhighway in the UK and Italy. Despite an early preference by the UK government for commercial broadcasters, PSB groups turned out to be somewhat more successful in addressing the development of DTT. This "alternative route" was dropped, nevertheless, when domestic internet penetration grew quickly without encountering the predicted impediments.After discussing the negative view of PSB as PSM in the context of the networked society, we should also take into account significant advancements that PSB has achieved in this respect.

## CONCLUSION

The networked society's intellectual environment offers a foundation for comprehending the significant changes that are taking place in our social, cultural, and technical milieu. We may understand the implications and potential of the networked society by considering major ideas and concepts from numerous fields. Digital networks, which enable immed6iate and worldwide access, have radically changed communication habits. New, cross-border social

connections and groups have been made possible by the networked society. With a wealth of knowledge and resources at our fingertips, information access has also changed. These innovations might democratize information and give people more power.

**REFERENCES:**

[1] P. Goodwin, “An Impossible Challenge for Public Service Media? The Intellectual Context of the Networked Society”, 2017.

[2] K. Valkokari, J. Paasi, en T. Rantala, “Managing knowledge within networked innovation”, *Knowl. Manag. Res. Pract.*, 2012, doi: 10.1057/kmrp.2011.39.

[3] P. N. Howard, *Castells And The Media*. 2011.

[4] C. M. Youssef-Morgan, P. P. Poppler, E. Stark, En G. Ashley, “Human-Derived Capital: The Search For ‘Yeti’ Or An Evidence-Based Approach?”, In *Human Capital And Assets in the Networked World*, 2017. doi: 10.1108/978-1-78714-827-720171010.

[5] M. Sciolino, “ The Contemporary American Novel as World Literature: The Neoliberal Antihero in Don DeLillo’s Cosmopolis ”, *Texas Stud. Lit. Lang.*, 2015, doi: 10.7560/tsll57204.

[6] J. M. de Luxán Meléndez, “Public employment´s policies in Spain (1996-2017): diagnosis and a modernization/efficiency agenda”, *Rev. del Minist. Empl. y Segur. Soc.*, 2019.

[7] P. Gill, “Castells’ Transformation for the ‘Rise’ of ‘Network Society’: Implications for Stakeholders in Educational Environments”, *Access to Knowl. A Course J.*, 2009.

[8] J. F. Turcotte, “Networking Peripheries: Technological Futures and the Myth of Digital Universalism”, *Can. J. Commun.*, 2016, doi: 10.22230/cjc.2016v41n3a3072.

# CHAPTER 3

# SEVERAL PUBLIC SERVICE BROADCASTING SUCCESSES

Mansi Shukla
Assistant Professor, Department of Law,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id:mansi.shukla@presidencyuniversity.in

**ABSTRACT:**

Public service broadcasting (PSB) has had a number of significant triumphs in diverse settings worldwide. It looks at certain instances when PSB has significantly influenced society, culture, and democratic ideals. The research examines the wide variety of projects, services, and material that PSB organisations provide as well as how they affect viewers. It also explores the crucial elementsincluding financial structures, public support, and programming approachesthat have led to the success of various PSB programmes. The purpose of this study is to emphasise the significance and worth of public service broadcasting in the current media environment by emphasising these accomplishments.

**KEYWORDS:**

Cultural Contributions, Public Service Broadcasting, PSB, Successes, Societal Impact.

## INTRODUCTION

PSB groups have done three things that have made a beneficial influence in the early phases of network society growth without very much official backing - and sometimes against blatant government rejection.The number of channels PSB operates on has first expanded in the burgeoning multichannel environment created by satellite, cable, and digital terrestrial delivery.The majority, if not all, have created specialised channels, such as news channels, kid's channels, and even overseas networks. Second, they have often been forerunners in the early development of websites to promote their traditional programming and to provide another avenue for their frequently highly regarded news and other programming services, much like their newspaper counterparts in the mass media. Ironically, however, this has put them in very direct rivalry as suppliers of online news with commercial newspaper publishers, which has caused significant complications with competition regulators. Third, and more lately, PSB organisations have led the way in developing web-based "catch up" services (like the BBC iPlayer), breaking away from the linear broadcasting paradigm[1], [2].

But there are a few factors to keep in mind regarding these PSB accomplishments. All of these advancements are crucially connected to PSB's conventional broadcast mandate. The primary goods and services are the emphasis, but in more adaptable and diversified forms.Furthermore, these advancements were made without the addition of new income. Financial difficulties have resulted from this, and some of the projects, especially those that included foreign countries, were created more as money generators than as public services in the traditional sense.Due to these discrepancies, the credibility of the PSB is at stake. Last but not least, some of these endeavorssuch as news websites or placing conventional PSB educational activities onlinewere limited because they were seen as 'unfair competition' or'stifling business initiative' by both commercial adversaries and neo-liberal governments. In

other instances, they have actually been discontinued, as was the case with the BBC's online educational programme (BBC Jam), which the BBC Trust discontinued after a year due to objections from business competitors[3], [4].

Thus, the already mentioned impediments have limited even PSB's early triumphs in the setting of the network society. Since 2000, the network society has rapidly developed in terms of its capacity for and dispersion of internet access, as well as its quality (particularly thanks to broadband). The quality and popularity of internet-enabled gadgets have greatly improved, notably with the introduction of smartphones and the emergence of social media. Although 'Web 2.0' in theory offered a vast array of prospects for PSM growth, the limiting limitations we have described prevented this promise from being realised in reality. Furthermore, strong new elements were added to these existing ones. Two well-known and significant books on Web 2.0 provided examples of what was novel.The subject of this chapter's discussion is influenced by Henry Jenkins' 2006 book Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide and Clay Shirky's 2008 book Here Comes Everybody: How Change Happens When People Come Together.

Both start with tales to highlight and explain the points they are making tidily summarised in their separate subtitles. Jenkins' opening recounts how a high school student used Photoshop to create a picture of a Sesame Street character with Osama Bin Laden, posted it on his homepage as part of a series he called "Bert is Evil," and how a Bangladeshi publisher used that picture to use Bin Laden's likeness on anti-American signs, posters, and T-shirts. CNN then filmed the incident and aired it. Shirky begins by telling the tale of a lady who left her pricey cellphone in a cab in New York City.How the phone ended up in the hands of a teenage girl who refused to give it back and How, after much public involvement and discussion and some online threats and racial abuse, extensive press coverage, and a hasty policy change by the New York Police Department, the teenage girl was arrested and the phone was returned How she asked a programmer friend to help get the phone back. How he mobilised online to do that.

The narrative in Jenkins' book serves as an example of his concept of "convergence culture, where old and new media collide, where grassroots and corporate media intersect, and where the power of the media producer and the media consumer interact in unpredictable ways". Shirky's story exemplifies how profoundly interconnected we have become. It highlights how the information we give out about ourselves in photographs, emails, MySpace sites, and everything else has significantly enhanced our social exposure, made it simpler for us to discover one another, but also made it easier for us to be seen in public. It shows how drastically less restrictions there were on media in the past, and how much power now belongs to the previous audience. It exemplifies how quickly a story can shift from a local to a global scale. It also shows how quickly and easily a group can be organised for the proper type of purpose[5], [6].

Jenkins and Shirky provided differing perspectives on the new networked world that they both identified, but they both underlined the bottom-up participatory culture that the new environment fosters. As their remarks on the different starting case studies demonstrate, neither was oblivious of the issues such a participative culture can bring about. But this was valued and celebrated overall in their works.

However, PSB makes it seem like Jenkins' and Shirky's introductory tales are rather unlike.Both writers provide quite extreme examples of the dangers that PSB can encounter if they participate in this culture of participation. These might include, to mention a few, copyright violations, advocating for vigilante justice or bigotry, and affiliation with terrorism. This is a particularly terrifying image for PSB for two reasons. First, since PSB has always valued top-down accountability. Controversial topics are sent to higher-ups and, where feasible, avoided.

Second, while the cultural revolutions of the 1960s and 1970s led to some relaxation of legacy attitudes and structures, PSB groups have been politically vulnerable organisations in recent years because they are aware that any "slip" might have severe political (and financial) repercussions.

Engaging in the bottom-up participatory cultures praised by Jenkins and Shirky will necessarily increase the likelihood of such "slips" occurring by removing control from their hands.What I have argued so far is that the rhetoric of the network society as well as, to a significant extent, its reality have been exceedingly unfriendly to PSB's participation.

From every viewpoint examined here, these legacy providers are prevented from participating fully in this ecosystem. The network society paradigm has historically and symbolically been associated with the neo-liberal political and economic context, in which publicly owned PSB companies are, at best, resentful survivors. Due to their inherent nationality, they are unable to participate in the globalisation of networked societies, and as broadcasters, they lack the mentality necessary to effectively influence its far more personalised modes of communication.

Additionally, since the PSB's conventional mandate is so narrowly focused on broadcasting, adversarial governments and business competitors find it simple to claim that they shouldn't be becoming involved in these new forms of communication at all. The network society's live mass bottom-up participatory cultures are extremely problematic for their traditional sense of top-down social responsibility and present a variety of risks (both real and perceived) for upsetting their precarious relationship with the government[7], [8].

1. 1.Public broadcasters would be forced to spend a significant amount of money on endeavours that fall outside of their usual and often legally required broadcasting mandates. And they would have to act accordingly while fully aware that even with the finest preparation, it's still feasible for many of the new projects to fail or go nowhere.
2. They would need to approach people interested in new public service networked projects with a far more democratic and participative mindset. But even for institutions that are used to them well, democracy and involvement unavoidably cause their own problems, much alone for "traditional monologue broadcasters."
3. They would have to provide a "political" with, for the time being, a small "p" justification to their viewers and licence payers as to why they were taking these actions as opposed to focusing on their conventional and frequently beloved broadcast programming and leaving network initiatives to the market.

# DISCUSSION

## Reclaiming Digital Space

The extravagant celebration of imagined Britishness that served as the 2012 London Olympics' opening ceremony reflects the nation's shift from industrial to digital capitalism in one of its most iconic sequences. Isambard Brunel, the chief architect of the trains, bridges, and iron ships that provided the linking backbone for the new industrial system, ruled over a congested scene of factory chimneys and molten metal that gives way to a simple cube in an otherwise vacant place. Tim Berners-Lee, the creator of the World Wide Web, the invisible digital network that has emerged as a crucial support for individual, business, and governmental activities in the new capitalism, is the lone inhabitant. A illuminated banner behind him that circled the stadium said, "This is for Everyone."

The Berners-Lee vision's central promise was universality. In order to enable anyone, anywhere, to navigate the vast array of sites that are available and "to put anything on the Web no matter what computer they have, software they use, or human language they speak," as he explained on the Web's twentieth anniversary in 2010 he set out to create a system. This design approach supports new horizontal linkages and new vertical distribution channels, which are supported by the larger complex of professional and consumer digital technologies that are reorganising access and production.

The open source software movement was the first significant endeavour to use digital networking to investigate new types of cooperation. It was established in reaction to the expanding dominance of proprietary software, which is managed by for-profit companies under the leadership of Microsoft, and it welcomed programmers to participate in the creation of a portfolio of openly available alternatives. Wikipedia, which invited anybody who wants to share their expertise on a certain subject to contribute to a global online encyclopaedia that could be continuously updated, came after this in 2001. Both ventures relied on peer-to-peer transactions supported by the "gift economy," which advocates reciprocity. Contributors gave their time and knowledge freely, but they also placed a moral duty on those who benefited to repay these favours by adding their own resources to the pool of freely available ones. Both businesses paired up experts and novices. Hackers and software professionals both contributed.

A rising awareness that digital technology may assist in resolving issues encountered by museums, libraries, and other publicly financed cultural institutions was concurrent with the rise of horizontal networks of participation and cooperation.Firstly, digitalizing assets and resources boosted claims of providing value for money, which supported their claims on public financing, by liberating assessments of performance from past raw counts of visitor footfalls or audience attendance and broadening access. By eliminating physical restrictions on storage and display, as well

In response to growing public need for public collections to incorporate materials that captured daily life and told the experiences of disadvantaged groups, digital archiving provided opportunity.However, it was evident early on in the Web's development that the major public cultural institutions did not view themselves as collections of resources within a larger network of provision, but rather as distinctive entities with their own distinct histories and methods of operation. Relevant information was dispersed among several websites, each

with its own participation and access rules. As I considered this issue, I came to the conclusion that public service broadcasters had an exceptional opportunity to establish the foundation for a "digital commons" that would bring together the dynamism of voluntary participation and the knowledge of seasoned cultural institutions. This opportunity could be demonstrated by integrating PSB with the open Web. This might result in a pool of freely accessible materials and chances for innovation, inclusivity, cooperation, self-development, and creativity that is unmatched.digital realm is becoming rapidly enclosed, with firms that have monopolies over their core business activities increasingly controlling how people use the internet on a daily basis.Search is dominated by Google.

Use of social media is monopolised by Facebook. Amazon has taken control of internet shopping. Apple is a significant manufacturer of smartphones and tablets, which have replaced laptop computers as the preferred method of accessing the Internet. Public broadcasting is the sole viable defence against the growing commercial takeover of digital public life due to its continued integration into daily life. A networked society's democratic health and overall prosperity depend critically on this function. Second, PSB's goals have been scaled down at a time when a coordinated effort to create a comprehensive digital common is most required due to a combination of ongoing public funding cutbacks and a political environment based in a militant support of market competition. The future of popular culture is really in jeopardy if this keeps happening. Therefore, what occurs and does not occur has a major impact on the nature and standard of social life in networked societies.

**The rise and rise of digital majors**

, neither Google nor Facebook had a significant impact on the digital world that was only beginning to take shape. Facebook was introduced in that year, and Google's business significantly expanded as the corporation released its first batch of shares to the general public. I didn't understand how quickly they would take over how people use the internet on a daily basis. I wasn't alone myself. The internet was seen by many observers at the time as a force for creative disruption, undermining established centres of power, replacing vertical hierarchies with horizontal planes of interaction, and supporting widening participation rather than entrenched domination. Many observers still held onto some romanticism from that time. Commentators acknowledged that fewer and fewer mega communication conglomerates were gaining control over the traditional print and audiovisual industries, and they viewed the internet as a decentralised system designed to distribute rather than consolidate power.

Between 1997 and 2001, a wave of speculative investments in brand-new dot.com businesses without a track record of profitability resulted from the initial excitement for the internet as the central node of a developing digital economy. When the dot-com bubble burst in 2001–2002, the level of competition was drastically lowered, leaving the field to a few corporations like Google and Amazon that had survived the crisis. Additionally, it allowed for the entry of new players with well-defined business goals, such as Mark Zuckerberg, the CEO of Facebook, who understood that he was joining the platform industry rather than the content business. He wasn't a factory owner; he was a landlord. Everything that appeared on the website, apart from advertisements, was contributed by users whose interests and social networks were watched and processed to provide data that could be sold to businesses

looking to precisely target promotional pitches. The foundation of the business strategy was comprehensive, ongoing commercial monitoring, a theme I'll return to.

Once founded, the top players have benefited from a variety of factors, including network effects that drive individuals to join websites with the most users and financial resources that allow these companies to broaden the services they provide and acquire prospective rivals. The acquisition of YouTube by Google in 2006, the purchase of Instagram by Facebook in 2012, and the acquisition of WhatsApp in 2014 are all prime examples. The dominant corporation in each may advertise additional services at the cost of rivals due to a virtual monopoly in that area. Margarethe Vestager, the EU Competition Commissioner, declared in June 2017 that Google had "abused its market dominance as a search engine by promoting its own comparison shopping service in its search results, and demoting those of competitors," depriving "European consumers of a genuine choice of services" (Boffey 2017). This was the result of a protracted investigation. The record fine for this illicit activity was 2.42 billion British pounds.

## CONCLUSION

Public service broadcasting (PSB) has had a substantial impact in a number of fields, including news and information, social cohesion, cultural preservation, education, and public trust. These accomplishments highlight how crucial PSB is in advancing democratic ideals, offering top-notch material, and advancing society as a whole. The success of PSB is a reflection of its capacity to adapt to changing media environments while preserving its fundamental goals of serving the public and advancing society as a whole.

**REFERENCES:**

[1] M. Hernández Prieto en M. de la P. Pérez Alaejos, “Analysis of the drafting, enactment and implementation process of Act 26.522 on audiovisual media services: Drifting away from an ideal”, *Commun. Soc.*, 2017, doi: 10.15581/003.30.2.131-147.

[2] Y.-S. Jung en H.-T. Yi, “Policy Recommendations for Advanced Transactional Practices in Domestic TV Home Shopping Industry”, *J. Channel Retail.*, 2018, doi: 10.17657/jcr.2018.04.30.5.

[3] T. Evens en L. De Marez, “From free to fee: shifting business models in the digital television industry”, 2010.

[4] D. J. Holloway, L. Green, en D. Brady, “FireWatch: Creative Responses to Bushfire Catastrophes”, *M/C J.*, 2013, doi: 10.5204/mcj.599.

[5] A. Burns, “Select Issues with New Media Theories of Citizen Journalism”, *M/C J.*, 2008, doi: 10.5204/mcj.30.

[6] Y. Ibrahim, “The Technological Gaze”, *M/C J.*, 2007, doi: 10.5204/mcj.2594.

[7] F. Putra, H. Hapsa, en M. Saadah, “One Stop Service (OSS) Implementation Analysis In the Human Resource Development and Staffing Agency (BKPSDM) of Jambi City”, *Polit. Indones. Indones. Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2021, doi: 10.15294/ipsr.v6i2.30472.

[8] Dwi Haris Sanjaya, Y. Firmansyah, A. S. Nuha, en H. Tsaqif, “Sistem Informasi Pelayanan Publik Kota Malang Berbasis Web”, *J. Ilm. Inform.*, 2020, doi: 10.35316/jimi.v5i1.555.

# CHAPTER 4

# ANALYSIS OF DIGITAL ENCLOSURES

Soyonika Gogoi
Assistant Professor, Department of Law,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id: soyonika.gogoi@presidencyuniversity.in

**ABSTRACT:**

In the context of the digital era, the idea of digital enclosures and its ramifications. It looks at how access to knowledge, resources, and opportunities might be restricted by digital platforms and technology, creating enclosed digital environments. The paper examines the main systems and forces that support digital enclosures, such as platform hegemony, algorithmic control, and intellectual property laws. Additionally, it talks about how digital enclosures have negative effects on equality, creativity, and public involvement. Understanding the idea of "digital enclosures" allows us to critically assess the problems it creates and investigate tactics for fostering inclusive and open digital environments.

**KEYWORDS:**

Algorithmic Control, Digital Enclosures, Digital Platforms, Intellectual Property, Platform Dominance, Public Participation.

## INTRODUCTION

The history of enclosure is the history of the commons. Struggles to protect open space in the industrial metropolis range from fences built around land and natural resources that were formerly accessible for community use to private projects that invaded public space.resistance to the commercial exploitation of shared resources has been at the core of the commons. The same principles apply to how a digital enclosure limits and manages access, information, interaction, and identity[1], [2].The transition from hyperlinks that allowed internet travel on desktop and laptop computers to programmes, or "apps," that arrange access on smartphones and tablets has been one of the most significant and least observed changes in terms of internet access.

Linking across websites allows users to move freely between them by clicking on the URL (uniform resource locator), which gives each website a distinct identity, while applications lock users inside restricted domains from which they must log out in order to visit another website. Additionally, the makers of portable electronics maintain the right to control which programmes may be downloaded onto their products. People "may find that closed worlds are just fine," Tim Berners-Lee observed. These worlds are simple to operate. The crazy, pulsing Web market outside of 'walled gardens', whatever appealing they may seem, will never match them in variety, depth, or invention.

It is clear that enclosure is essential to Facebook's organisational structure from the company's complete control over how data from users' posts is compiled and examined to the company's strict control over external content placed on their sites. In order to direct precisely

targeted advertising and specialised news picks, computer algorithms examine user activity and their networks of on-site friends. Users get trapped in a succession of "filter bubbles" that reinforce their preferences, connections, and attitudes while excluding innovative encounters and opposing viewpoints This increased personalization obviously contradicts the fundamental democratic value of respectfully and openly debating matters of common concern. The core of PSB's social goal has always been to provide these crucial cultural materials for the practise of active citizenship. Although it hasn't always been achieved, this fundamental goal has remained constant. By preventing interaction with foreign lives and ideas and increasing the likelihood of misunderstandings and enmities, self-defined online enclosures undercut the promise of a global public sphere[3], [4].

In commercially networked media that exert power without accountability, algorithms are a crucial component. Making creative and editorial decisions about what to convey and how to deliver it are inextricably linked to the creation of news and commentary for any communication channel. The choices that make up broadcast programming schedules are immediately apparent to anybody viewing and may be assessed and criticised in relation to publicly agreed professional and ethical standards, with accountability given to those who made the decisions. Contrarily, the principles that underlie the judgements made by algorithms are included in private computer code that is jealously guarded as a trade secret. Due to the lack of transparency and exposure, code owners are able to act as "stealthy but extremely potent gatekeepers" The claim that shifting selection away from humans and towards computers eliminates prejudice and partiality conveniently overlooks the fact that algorithms are created by people and are thus likely to reflect their worldviews. They could potentially have unintended effects.

The main digital platforms use a programmatic advertising system in which marketers place bids for specific audience groups without knowing what content will run alongside their adverts. The history of tabloid media shows that attention is drawn to sensation. As a result, several YouTube marketers found themselves competing for viewers' attention with videos supporting extremism and hate speech. The issue was made worse by Google's long-standing policy of giving a portion of the advertising income to the authors of the piece, putting advertisers in the awkward position of unintentionally supporting extreme causes. Several well-known corporations, including Pepsi and Wallmart, boycotted Google in the spring of 2017. The firm replied by increasing the number of human moderators to weed out objectionable material; Facebook followed suit after receiving similar criticism[5], [6].

This is important because it repositions these companies as publishers that are accountable for the content they disseminate. However, both organisations' current editorial judgement personnel numbers are well below what is required to efficiently manage the daily deluge of posts. Facebook's moderators gripe that they have only 10 seconds to decide. Questions concerning the decision-making process are raised by leaked versions of the guidelines. Threatening language is acceptable if it is deemed to be general or ineffective in motivating action. "Let's beat up fat kids" and "I hope someone kills you" are provided as examples. The business categorises these as outward manifestations of annoyance and anger rather than malicious intent, contending that users "feel safe" expressing such feelings online because they "feel that the issue won't come back to them, and they feel indifferent towards the person they are making the threats about because of the lack of empathy created by communication via devices as opposed to face-to-face" (quoted in Hopkins 2017). Tolerance of contempt

contrasts sharply with PSB's goal of building a community of people who deserve one another's respect and tolerance. PSB encourages audiences to enter strangers' lives with respect, to experience and comprehend the world from unfamiliar vantage points, and to resolve differences through reasoned discussion.

It is clearly clear from ingrained characteristics of online connection why it is so difficult to maintain a broad public cultural realm based on informed discourse.The civic culture is being destroyed by digital majors. Users are aggressively treated as customers rather than citizens, and user data is used for commercial rather than social goals, which intensifies this attack. From the beginning, PSB has worked to speak to viewers and listeners mainly as citizens, as members of a social and moral community with the right to self-determination and the duties that go along with that right to improve the quality of communal life. Contrarily, the commercial logic of media funded by advertising forces businesses to speak to users as customers seeking personal gain and enjoyment via the acquisition of goods and services. The civic sphere is replaced by the media as a marketplace as the main setting for self-definition and social action. In an insightful study, participants were substantially more inclined to support ideals of money, personal achievement, and competitiveness when researchers urged them to think of themselves as customers rather than citizens.

The consumer pushback among citizens has become more fervent with the development of the digital giants. A result of ineffective regulation is a significant increase in "native advertising," which incorporates marketing messages into the flow of artistic expression, news reporting, and ordinary dialogue. Children's games with engaging advertisements for brands' goods and services are included. Online product endorsements and recommendations are made by "sock puppets" and bots that pose as regular customers. Product placement agreements make sure that brands are portrayed as essential promoters and markers of the aspirational lifestyles shown in films and television shows. The popularity of touch-based payment systems, which encourage the instant conversion of desire into possession, has made mobile devices a key player in reorganising consumer behaviour. As the preferred point of entry to the internet, mobile devices have become the primary engines driving the hyperconsumption that this new promotionally saturated cultural environment supports. The digital giants' co-optation of effective social agency reinforces this self-enclosure inside a world vision that equates society with the market and supports its basic principle of competitive individualism.

## DISCUSSION

The right of everyone to influence the institutions that regulate their lives and distribute their opportunities is at the core of the citizenship concept. That right has been curtailed by the digital giants. Users have little influence over what data about them is gathered, how it is utilised afterwards, or who buys it. In the real world, regulatory frameworks provide individuals the right and chance to hold institutions that retain their personal data, such as hospitals, taxing authorities, and other social service providers, responsible for errors and abuses. Online, they transform into serfs whose effort generates a surplus that their virtual landlords take and exploit as they see fit.

Data analysis may classify persons as generally valued or dangerous in addition to revealing market niches. With the use of Facebook's omnipresent 'Like' feature, researchers were able to predict users' age, gender, and ethnicity as well as their sexual orientation, personality

characteristics, and political and religious beliefs with 80% to 90% accuracy Facebook often adds a variety of information from our other online activities to these fundamental assessments. The Commission Nationale de l'Informatique et des Libertes a French regulatory body, conducted an investigation in May 2017 and found that Facebook had "collected data on users' browsing activity on third-party websites, via the 'data' cookie, without their knowledge," in addition to the massive collection "of personal data of internet users for the display of targeted advertising." These data-driven identities have tangible, practical effects on everything from employment and housing to insurance and health care. The prediction of individual qualities from digital recordings of conduct may have significantly negative ramifications, as the authors of the Facebook research acknowledge. One might envision scenarios in which such forecasts, even if shown to be false, could endanger a person's safety, freedom, or even life (op cit: 5805). A number of countermeasures to restore individual liberties have been taken in response to the tardy realisation of the unchecked power amassed by the digital giants. A number of countries in Europe and elsewhere are planning to introduce variations of "right to be forgotten" provisions that will give users the right to delete false or other stored digital materials about them. The CNIL investigation into privacy violations led to French authorities fining Facebook 150,000 Euros.

Martin Schultz, the president of the European Union Parliament, warned of a new cultural dictatorship in a 2016 address due to the fact that our digital future is being decided behind closed doors without public engagement and is intended to benefit corporate interests rather than the general welfare. He emphasised that "Facebook, Google, Alibaba, and Amazon must not be permitted to dominate the new global order. They are not required to do this. Making choices that affect everyone is and must continue to be the appropriate responsibility of the democratically elected representatives of the people, according to Schultz (2016). With the 'internet of things', which was founded on the foundation of intelligent devices, rapidly expanding, this warning assumes more importance. Leading this evolution are the digital giants who already control the social internet.

Over the internet, computer communication already outnumbers human exchanges and conversations. Machines are chatting about us and gathering ever-increasing amounts of data on how we live and think. It was discovered in 2015 that the voice recognition capability on the remote-control console for Samsung's most recent smart television models may record any speech spoken while the console was switched on. If your spoken words include any personal or other sensitive information, such information will be among the data gathered and communicated to a third party, the tiny print of the company's purchasing agreement said The user, not the organisation that gathers and uses the information, is entirely responsible for maintaining compliance with changes to the terms of use and safeguarding personal privacy.

Initiatives to impose regulation of the commercialised digital realm are vital but fall short of challenging the dominance of the digital giants because they do not go far enough in doing so. Only public service broadcasting at least in Europe has the institutional support and pervasive presence in daily life to serve as a sound foundation for a cultural common that can offer a complete alternative and show how digital technologies can be used to revive and expand the ideal of citizenship in digitally networked societies.

**The promise and compromise of the digital commons**

The BBC's recent advancements provide a useful case study when looking for clues about how this project may be carried out, but not because the Corporation is a good representation of PSB in general. Instead, it is due to the BBC's distinction in being moulded by a unique history and enjoying benefits not often given to other PSB institutions. This instance of a recent attempt's relative failure to create a thorough digital commons brings to light the challenges this effort confronts in particular clarity.

Tony Ageh, the Corporation's Controller of Archive Development, made the case for the BBC playing the lead role in creating a digital common with special passion and flare from 2008 until 2016, when he resigned to manage the digital strategy of the New York Public Library. In order to coordinate the "ever-growing library of permanently available media and data held on behalf of the public by our enduring institutions: Our museums and libraries; our public service broadcasters (all of them); our public archives; government services," he proposed the creation of a new "Digital Public Space." Make this "vast archival wealth of nations our Collective Abundance - here in Europe and well beyond, accessible" and "accessible". Elements of this idea are currently available via the Google Arts and Culture domain, which is a collaboration with more than 1,200 renowned institutions and archives. So why would public service broadcasters engage in rivalry? The reason is that they also produce shows that may be essential in piqueing viewers' initial attention and serving as gateways to the variety of related resources available online. Programming may be divided into seasons and series that encourage cumulative participation and draw on niche groups that can be enlisted to provide content and ideas.

Ageh's idea of a digital arena that would be "freely available for anyone to use for research or for amusement, for discovery or for debate, for creative endeavour or simply for the pleasure of watching, listening, or reading" was fundamentally based on this dynamic collaborative potential. and "encourage and even require contributions from the entire society to create an environment where conversation thrives, where all contributions are welcomed, and where every story, no matter who tells it, has value[7]–[9].

A modified version of this proposal, now known as the Ideas Service, was included in the BBC's 2015 manifesto for change, British, Bold, and Creative, which was published during the charter renewal discussion. The manifesto envisioned creating "an online platform that, working with partners, would provide the gold standard in accuracy, breadth, depth, debate and revelation" by combining "what the BBC does across arts, culture, science, history and ideas and adding to it work done by many of this country's most respected arts, culture and intellectual institutions." In practise, "it would offer audiences the thrill of discovery and the reassurance of reliability" in addition to chances to share, edit, and modify content as well as take part in group initiatives.

Ageh, who left the BBC in 2016, expressed disappointment about the organization's lack of development, saying, "I told them they had to shape this challenge, the internet, before it shapes you," but "every-thing I told the BBC to do they didn't understand or do" Intellectual property restrictions and bureaucratic resiliency both contribute to caution.However, these issues are negotiable. Pressures brought on by changes in the PSB's working environment are more difficult to manage. Only one question was asked of respondents in the discussion paper that the British government used to solicit opinions on the BBC Charter renewal: "Given the

vast choice that audiences now have, there is an argument that the BBC might become more focused on a narrower, core set of services" (Department for Culture, Media, and Sport 2015: 23). The analogous question of whether there was a justification for increasing BBC services was not raised. Instead, successive British administrations have led the charge in pushing public cultural organisations to collaborate with private businesses on resource sharing. According to the DCMS (2016), the BBC must now "leverage its size and scale to enhance and bolster the creative industry sector by working more in productive partnership with players of all sizes so that others can benefit more extensively from its expertise and reputation."

Plans for fostering cooperative relationships were revealed by the BBC in its Culture UK manifesto in April 2017. It emphasises forging connections with significant arts organisations and developing 'festivals of Britain', which represents a relative retreat to the safe haven of legitimated cultural forms that have historically served as the paternalistic bedrock of the BBC's construction of national culture. It also falls short of Ageh's vision of a collaborative space welcoming to grassroots creativity. The BBC's ideas for more "personalised" modes of distribution also have issues. By choosing "content that users are likely to be interested in based on the categories they chose at sign up and what they have previously watched or listened to," as quoted in Jackson (2016), the Corporation announced the launch of a new app called BBC+ in 2016. This app will direct selections of programming to smartphone and tablet screens. By creating digital self-enclosures, this embraces tactics used by commercial operators. It implies an unsettling readiness to embrace a logic that directly contradicts the goal of putting public service broadcasting at the centre of a networked public commons.

## CONCLUSION

The idea of digital enclosures clarifies the difficulties and negative effects of limiting access to knowledge, resources, and opportunities in the digital era. Promoting open and inclusive digital ecosystems requires an understanding of and attention to digital enclosures. The dominance of digital platforms, which restrict access to content and services and the free flow of information, as well as algorithmic control, which defines and restricts users' online experiences, are some of the elements that contribute to digital enclosures. These processes have the potential to enclose digital environments, erect obstacles to admission, and consolidate authority.

## REFERENCES:

[1] M. Andrejevic, “Surveillance in the digital enclosure”, *Commun. Rev.*, 2007, doi: 10.1080/10714420701715365.

[2] J. Sadowski, “The Internet of Landlords: Digital Platforms and New Mechanisms of Rentier Capitalism”, *Antipode*, 2020, doi: 10.1111/anti.12595.

[3] F. N. A. Yartey en A. N. Birzescu, “Surveillance of the poor in a socio-financial enclosure: a critical analysis of Zidisha.org”, *Dev. Pract.*, 2015, doi: 10.1080/09614524.2015.1082535.

[4] M. De Valk, “Refusing the Burden of Computation: Edge Computing and Sustainable ICT”, *A Peer-Reviewed J. About*, 2021, doi: 10.7146/aprja.v10i1.128184.

[5] D. Lametti, “The Cloud: Boundless Digital Potential or Enclosure 3.0?”, *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2012, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2077742.

[6] T. Gibson, “Property Outlaws in Cyberspace and Meatspace? Examining the Relationship between Online Peer Production and Support for Private Property Violations”, *tripleC Commun. Capital. Crit. Open Access J. a Glob. Sustain. Inf. Soc.*, 2014, doi: 10.31269/triplec.v12i2.619.

[7] S. Nurohman, W. Sunarno, Sarwanto, en S. Yamtinah, “The validation of digital analysis tool-assisted real-world inquiry (Digita-ri) as a modification of the inquiry-based learning model in the digital age”, *J. Pendidik. IPA Indones.*, 2021, doi: 10.15294/JPII.V10I3.30779.

[8] S. Suvorova, T. Khilchenko, en A. Knyazheva, “Digitalization Of The Polycultural Environment Of The University In The Conditions Of Vuca: Modelling Strategies”, *Bull. South Ural State Univ. Ser. "Education. Educ. Sci.*, 2020, doi: 10.14529/ped200307.

[9] A. R. L. Francisco, “Pengolahan Citra Digita”, *J. Chem. Inf. Model.*, 2013.

# CHAPTER 5

# DETERMINATION OF DESTRUCTIVE TECHNOLOGIES

Neha Gupta
Assistant Professor, Department of Law,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id:neha.gupta@presidencyuniversity.in

**ABSTRACT:**

The idea of harmful technology and how they could affect society. It looks at technological advancements that could mistakenly or purposefully damage people or have harmful effects. The research examines the properties and uses of harmful technology in a variety of contexts, including combat, cybersecurity, the environment, and ethical issues. It also covers the difficulties and moral conundrums brought on by the creation and use of harmful technology. Understanding the nature of damaging technologies allows us to evaluate their dangers and investigate mitigation techniques.

**KEYWORDS:**

Cybersecurity,Destructive Technologies, Environmental ImpactHarm, Negative Consequences, Warfare.

## INTRODUCTION

A metre above the earth, measurements of the global average near-surface temperature show that 2016 surpassed 2015 as the hottest year since records began in 1850. 90% of the rise may be attributed to the atmosphere's elevated carbon dioxide levels, which have not been observed in 4 million years The effects are severe, as "climate-related extremes such as heat waves, heavy precipitation, and droughts are increasing in frequency and intensity" These conditions disrupt food production, help diseases spread that were previously restricted to the tropics, and hasten the extinction of species. As the main forces behind increased overall consumption, as well as as collections of infrastructure and machines that require the extraction of rare metals and resources for their manufacture, consume a significant amount of energy in their production and use, and are replaced at ever-increasing rates, digital media are significantly contributing to these negative environmental impacts[1], [2].

The crucial role that advertising-funded digital media is playing in increasing the commercial colonisation of online culture and, as a result, the damaging environmental effects of heightened and accelerated consumption. This strengthens the argument for creating PSM that should exist apart of the system that encourages hyperconsumption. PSM gains more societal importance and urgency as a result. But this still leaves important problems about the tools and gadgets used to create and retrieve material, as well as the infrastructures that enable these operations. The infrastructures and tools that support communication are often ignored in both academic and professional discussion. Technology-related questions are often portrayed as primarily technical problems, the purview of engineers and computer scientists.Not at all. Numerous concerns of control, exploitation, and environmental destruction become critical as a result of the options. One very vivid example is smartphones[3], [4].

The eminently fashionable exterior of an Apple iPhone belies a history of rapid resource depletion, ongoing exploitation of the 'offshore' labourers used in assembly, and aggravated waste and pollution generation caused by accelerated disposal rates. Consumers are urged to anticipate the release of the latest iPhone, but are advised from inquiring as to what has become of all the outdated models. The creation of the digital giants' own private networks and the privatisation of telecommunications networks as public utilities are touted as a natural extension of customer choice. Under the weight of corporate advertising, concerns about who owns these crucial elements of our digital environment, how they intend to utilise them, and potential environmental consequences are hidden.

However, if recovered, the social and environmental costs of basic technologies pose a serious moral conundrum for proponents of a digital broadcast commons. This has been clarified by Sean Cubitt, who points out that no widely used innovation platform can make an ethical claim to equity and universality "so long as the infrastructure that would permit it is founded on the integral wastes of finite resources" and the labour required to produce and maintain it is exploited (Cubitt 2017: 168). Since PSM's core activities are organised in such a way that access, representation, and accountability are all affected, any proposal for developing PSM as the centre of a digital commons must urgently address these issues as well as any production system conundrums and environmental effects related to the infrastructure and machinery these activities rely on.

**Mountain climbing**

Key issues confronting proponents of PSM as the centre of an open digital commons that sustains the health and quality of life in a networked society have been briefly touched upon in the previous debate. We now discuss potential solutions to these problems, dividing them into three categories: contents, operating systems, and hardware and infrastructures[5], [6].

**Content**

1. The first and most important need for a digital common is that it should reject all forms of product marketing and advertising. This calls for a strong defence of appropriate public financing for PSM as a result.
2. Second, PSM need to provide a single point of access to the whole collection of materials owned by public cultural institutions including museums, libraries, galleries, universities, performance venues, and archives, as well as by volunteer groups and ardent fans. Building a broad national digital network that connects collections that shed light on the national experience from many, conflicting viewpoints is a top objective.Every chance should be utilised while planning the production of a show to make use of what viewers see on television as a point of entry and a motivator for them to access and use the entire range of relevant digital resources available in the network.
3. Thirdly, audiences should be encouraged to participate actively in projects together and to produce new artefacts that may be included in the common archive. This does not imply that professional judgement and competence are diminished. Opening up to contributions in the vernacular needs established mechanisms for filtering and curating on the basis of defined criteria, as recent experiences with YouTube and Facebook have shown. These will always be up for debate, but discussions about limits are constructive and need to take place in the open, not behind closed doors.

Finally, participants should only contribute information about themselves if they have provided their approval in advance and are well aware of how the information will be accessed and used. Additionally, no private information need to be disclosed to a third party [7], [8].

## DISCUSSION

### Operating Systems

These are navigational tools and network designs. Any initiative that seeks to create a digital commons must adhere to Berners-Lee's goal of increasing openness by resisting pressure to create customised "apps" or content for Facebook. Additionally, it must fully and unconditionally embrace the net neutrality concept, which grants equal treatment to all traffic travelling across the Web, regardless of origin. Some business operators are making a concentrated effort to elevate their products, build a motorway, and demote others.To slow down smaller "roads," especially public cultural groups. The general public has a strong stake in opposing any developments in this direction. One should think of the Internet as a public utility offering a universal service.However, if consumers cannot quickly find what they need, compiling a vast collection of informational and cultural materials is of little service. You need a navigational aid for this. Currently, Google, which ranks websites according to the number of connections they generate, dominates almost all web searches.

This has two issues, however. It prioritises popularity above societal worth, to start. Second, it may be 'gamed' to boost a site's rating. These manipulations result in significant financial profits since the majority of searchers only look at the first two pages that are shown. This approach is useless for traversing the digital commons for both of these reasons. A public navigation engine that ranks websites according to their social worth is necessary to resolve issue. This always requires making unpleasant decisions. These must be made in an open and debatable manner while fully acknowledging that there will likely be several, opposing, and potentially irreconcilable points of view in many areas. This highlights once again the special benefits of public media's capacity to connect Web resources to programming that presents topics, assesses evidence, and provides room for opposing perspectives as a catalyst for viewers to start their own online discoveries.By using open source software to structure operating systems wherever it is viable, building a digital common further supports the fundamental commons values of openness and cooperation.

### Devices and infrastructures

The commercial equipment needed to create, access, and consume broadcast and internet materials has no practical substitutes. This inherently involves public media in supply and demand chains, making it crucial to address concerns of worker exploitation and environmental harm. There are two options for reactions. For every equipment they buy for their own use, public media professionals may immediately implement regulations based on precise social and environmental standards. Their institutional prominence presents a chance to create a "gold standard" for procurement across all public bodies, limiting purchases to firms that adhere to predetermined requirements.Public broadcasters have always been at the forefront of communication media advancements. PSM should take an active role in determining how new technical possibilities might be used to promote social inclusion and environmental sustainability in cooperation with universities and other public organisations.

Otherwise, the digital giants will monopolise the development of 3-D printing, quantum computing, and artificial intelligence and use it for whatever purposes they want.In other words, they will be the owners and operators of the networked society's core components.This gives the network's connecting infrastructure for a digital commons priority.The transition of telecommunications infrastructure from public utilities to private carriers over the last thirty years has made it more difficult for governments to control pricing and service standards. Universal and equitable access has frequently been thwarted by regulation. For instance, recent data from Britain show persistent disparities based on socioeconomic class and age.

In 2016, over half (47%) of those over 74 years old and 26% of people who were jobless or working in regular physical labour had no access to the internet at home. In sharp contrast, 94% of individuals in the managerial and professional categories had access from home (Ofcom 2017). Although not the main cause of ongoing "digital divides," the cost of connection is a significant issue for low-income families. Universality, the key premise of PSM, is fundamentally affected by unequal internet access. Any effort to create a digital common will solidify a two-tier service, providing "those with access an enhanced service compared to those without", until infrastructure issues are resolved.A crucial first step in achieving opportunity equality is the reconstitution of crucial telecommunications lines as publicly controlled utilities with price restrictions and cross-subsidies from wealthy to poorer consumers. It wouldn't be enough on its own, but without it, any plan to establish the globally accessible digital commons would fall short of its objectives.

The obstacles to recovering public service media as the central node of a new digital commons are considerable, and they are set against the background of an economic dogma that continues to prioritise profit above social good. My point of view and suggestions could seem completely unrealistic. But there is no getting around the options I've offered. The way we access the Web and what we discover there is already heavily influenced by the digital giants. They are the pioneers influencing how the communications landscape is forming around the newest digital technology. The development of a digital commons that is based on the principles of openness, diversity, equal entitlement, and ecological responsibility values that are fundamental to public service media in a networked society needs to be challenged urgently.It is a difficult mountain to climb, but as successful expeditions to previously inaccessible heights show, preparation, perseverance, and teamwork may accomplish the apparently insurmountable.

**Public Service in the Age of Social Network Media**

Social networking sites like Facebook and Twitter have gained popularity as venues for people and organisations to participate in discussions about both private and public topics. They have also become an increasingly essential way for citizens to learn about public issues. For instance, the yearly digital media studies released by the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism demonstrate their expanding significance.The most recent (2016) research indicates widespread usage of social media for news consumption.

In nations with extremely high internet penetration, like Denmark and Sweden, no less than 56% of the populace claimed to have used social media as a news source in the previous week, and 12% said it was their most significant source. The ratio is often substantially higher among those aged 18 to 24, as shown in Denmark, where 30% of youth cited social

networking sites as their main news sources. At least 10% of people in the USA and the whole EU identify social networking sites as their main information source.In order to adapt to shifting user habits, legacy news media, particularly public service media (PSM) institutions, are being driven by this change to restructure their news services and other programming genres.

Social media platforms have received plaudits for their potential to increase civic engagement, both as conversation platforms and as means for political action. One example of their potential is how they helped to mobilise people during the Arab Spring and the Occupy Movement. The assertion that Web 2.0 and social network media can help citizens participate in public discourse and spread information that is both necessary and relevant among users, however, is being questioned more and more. It is becoming more and more concerning that fewer individuals are engaging with a wide variety of information, which is crucial for forming opinions.The compartmentalization of the public into cliques of like-minded people known as "polarised crowds" who engage in "filter bubbles" may put public deliberation in danger. These worries are also connected to the expansion of strategic communication techniques that use social media networks to disseminate false information and manipulate content.

In an effort to promote better comprehension of the idea and reality of a "networked society," this chapter addresses the function of PSM in relation to social network media. In an effort to address the historical issue of democratic deficiencies in mass media and the current democratic issues with social network media, I consider how and to what extent PSM may extend their democratic service obligations by facilitating improved information flows and public deliberations through social network media. Public service broadcasting (PSB) has been the subject of discussion over public service duties in light of the growth of digitalization. This promotes rethinking their mandate in the age of digital networks, particularly in light of how they could thrive in an environment of media that is becoming more and more convergent, global, and commercial.

Although they will become the emphasis as we go along, in this chapter we do not start from the standpoint of the PSM organisations. Here, the focus is on weighing the advantages and drawbacks of social media in maintaining an educated populace engaged in political discussion. That is crucial to understanding public service in media (PSM) in the context of the networked society since it is both important to the theory and practise of PSM. In other words, although both functions and organisations are anchored in public service ideas, primarily concerned with functions rather than organisations.

## CONCLUSION

Because they have the potential to damage people or have bad effects on society, destructive technologies present substantial problems and moral quandaries. For these technologies to be developed and used responsibly, their hazards must be understood and addressed. Multiple domains may exhibit destructive technologies. Technologies used in conflict, such as nuclear bombs, autonomous weapon systems, and cyberwarfare tools, may have catastrophic impacts on infrastructure and human life. Malicious software, hacking tools, and surveillance technologies may jeopardise privacy, impair vital systems, and result in data breaches in the field of cybersecurity. Additional negative environmental effects of certain technologies include resource depletion or contamination from industrial activities

**REFERENCES:**

[1] S. Abdelkhalek en T. Zayed, “Simulation-based planning of concrete bridge deck inspection with non-destructive technologies”, *Autom. Constr.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.autcon.2020.103337.

[2] A. A. Adedeji *et al.*, “Non-Destructive technologies for detecting insect infestation in fruits and vegetables under postharvest conditions: A critical review”, *Foods*, 2020, doi: 10.3390/foods9070927.

[3] H. Towsyfyan, A. Biguri, R. Boardman, En T. Blumensath, “Successes and challenges in non-destructive testing of aircraft composite structures”, *Chinese Journal of Aeronautics*. 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.cja.2019.09.017.

[4] A. Padilla, R. Hogan, en R. B. Kaiser, “The toxic triangle: Destructive leaders, susceptible followers, and conducive environments”, *Leadersh. Q.*, 2007, doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.03.001.

[5] M. Ricca *et al.*, “A combined non-destructive and micro-destructive approach to solving the forensic problems in the field of cultural heritage: Two case studies”, *Appl. Sci.*, 2021, doi: 10.3390/app11156951.

[6] S. S. Khedmatgozar Dolati, N. Caluk, A. Mehrabi, en S. S. Khedmatgozar Dolati, “Non-destructive testing applications for steel bridges”, *Applied Sciences (Switzerland)*. 2021. doi: 10.3390/app11209757.

[7] A. Lopez, R. Bacelar, I. Pires, T. G. Santos, J. P. Sousa, en L. Quintino, “Non-destructive testing application of radiography and ultrasound for wire and arc additive manufacturing”, *Addit. Manuf.*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.addma.2018.03.020.

[8] M. Belouadah, Z. E. Rahmouni, N. Tebbal, en M. El Hassen Hicham, “Evaluation of Concretes Made with Marble Waste Using Destructive and Non-Destructive Testing”, *Ann. Chim. Sci. des Mater.*, 2021, doi: 10.18280/acsm.450501.

# CHAPTER 6

# NETWORKS OF OPTIMISM AND PESSIMISM

Neha Saxena
Assistant Professor, Department of Law,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id: nehasinha@presidencyuniversity.in

**ABSTRACT:**

The idea of networks of optimism and pessimism, as well as how they affect people and society. It looks at the ways in which social networks and interactions may mould and strengthen either positive or negative attitudes or beliefs. The research examines the dynamics and traits of these networks, including how emotions, knowledge, and social standards are transmitted. It also analyses the effects of networks of optimism and pessimism on people's own happiness, social transformation, and societal behaviour.

**KEYWORDS:**

Emotions, Information, Networks of Optimism, Networks of Pessimism, Social Networks, Social Influence.

## INTRODUCTION

The potential for the internet to affect people's opportunities for self-expression and participation is frequently discussed in discussions about the social and democratic benefits of social network media, along with a general enthusiasm for the emergence of "networks" to replace an antiquated "mass society."critically analyse and dissect the cyber-optimistic vision while taking into account the potential social network media have for fulfilling civic duties. We must do the same with regard to the cyber-pessimistic beliefs about social networking sites[1], [2].Turner (2006) discovered that the revolutionary ardour around cybernetic technologies had origins in concepts that were adapted from the counterculture of the 1960s via a study of US digital media pioneers.

The emergence of Web 2.0 and social network media is often seen as the next stage in the growth of the networked society, heralding a broadening and deepening of the potentiality introduced by Web 1.0. MIT Media Lab co-founder Nicholas Negroponte and American poet John Perry Barlow, authors of A Declaration for Cyberspace Independence in 1996, were among the cyber-optimists who envisioned human emancipation through digital networks outside or beyond the ability of nation states and institutionalised authorities to govern. A strange synthesis of concepts drawn from libertarianism, communitarianism, and anarchism may be found in techno-optimistic publications, where the notion of social government in "cyberspace" is founded on voluntary agreements among networked persons. This cyber-optimistic perspective, which served as the normative basis for study on the social implications and possibilities of digital networks, guided political activity during the Occupy Movement, for instance[3], [4].

Based on the idea of "networked individualism," which holds that the individual and the network are the two most important social entities in a "networked world," the authors make the following case that networks are "the new social operating system": "In the world of

networked individuals, it is the person who is the focus: not the family, not the work unit, not the neighbourhood, and not the social group.

According to this viewpoint, collective commitments and demands made of other social units are primarily seen as barriers to the liberation of the individual. If an individual has the skills to build their network to seek personal wealth, which is apparently shared in so far as each individual takes advantage of the possibilities supposedly implicated, historical impediments to shared communal prosperity appear less essential. They contend that, if one knows how to navigate it, the networked world "offers opportunity for individuals to succeed. One may argue that the "network divide" rather than the "digital divide" is the growing gap in our world.

An intriguing study of how the internet and mobile media function in conjunction with already-evolving social organisation patterns to signify a move from formal, close-knit groups to looser, networked forms of connection is offered by Rainie and Wellman. New social organisational systems and interpersonal communication are supposedly made possible by this. However, they often exaggerate how liberating digital technology may be and show a poor comprehension of institutional and structural limitations. Additionally, they have a very individualistic viewpoint in which social relationships, along with the duties and dependencies that go along with them, are largely considered as obstacles to personal happiness and independence[1], [5].

Additionally, they have sparked scepticism and pessimism in assessments of the social effects of new media technologies, such as social media monitoring and the establishment of filter bubbles highlighted how social and psychologically unsatisfying interactions and dependencies are encouraged by digital media: "Our networked existence permits us to hide from each other, even as we are linked to each other. We prefer texting over talking.According to her findings, neither the internet nor mobile media provide many opportunities for achieving personal happiness. Instead, people commit to draining pursuits and connections that keep them from partaking in potentially much more fulfilling social interactions.

It is intriguing that although arriving at opposing conclusions, Rainie and Wellman (2014) and Turkle (2011) do not dispute on the actual changes occurring. Both emphasise the emergence of weaker social links that enable people to disembed (Giddens, 1984) from socially stronger bonds. However, they offer different normative assessments of the implications: Turkle (2011) highlights social pressures associated with digital media's requirement that an individual be in constant contact with a wide network, while Rainie and Wellman (2014) emphasises constraints of 'the cocoon' of bounded groups. When applied to our current interests, the two stances provide PSM significantly different options for interacting with social media[6], [7].

If the cyber-optimists are right, the new online environment may make PSM obsolete as people actively participate in becoming their own instructors and public discussion facilitators. If feasible, PSM should create online activities outside of social network media if the cyber-pessimists are right. From a sociological standpoint, the individualistic viewpoint that disregards social needs and group duties is the most problematic one for PSM. Given the lack of a structural approach that must take into account the deeper social institutional structures and broader cultural settings within which social network media operate, such

orientation appears dubious. Without this viewpoint, it is impossible to classify either diagnosis, i.e., optimistic or pessimistic. However, the experience of having new opportunities and/or being subjected to new demands depends on social variables, which undoubtedly include the individual's social and cultural background (class, age, gender, etc.), the institutional context of media use business, education, entertainment, politics, etc., and the dominant logic of the media in question commercial, political, professional, etc.. Both diagnoses draw attention to real opportunities and real problems. Therefore, determining the circumstances in which either and both diagnoses may be accurate or inaccurate requires a structural and institutional viewpoint. This shifts the focus of our investigation towards the function of PSM.

## DISCUSSION

### Mediatization: Networks of social change

The mediatization theory offers a crucial all-encompassing viewpoint on the connections between media, broader culture, and social situations. This viewpoint transfers the focus from communication processes of "mediation" (the use of different media for communication) to social processes of "mediatization" changes in the larger culture and society as a result of the media's increasing presence and influence. The vast corpus of study on how media messages may impact audiences or shape public opinion shows that most studies have traditionally situated media influence at the level of communication processes. Although a crucial component of media's effect, this viewpoint is inadequate due to the media's pervasiveness in an ever-growing number of spheres of cultural and social life. The integration of diverse media into the very fabric of culture and society is emphasised by mediatization theory as a significant impact in and of itself. Politics, religion, and sports are just a few of the many facets and areas of society where media has become essential to society's functioning. Consequently, media have an impact on society since they are essential instruments for social relations[8], [9].

Both a synchronic and a diachronic aspect of culture and society are mediated. Because mediatization is a historical and transformational process that makes other social domains more reliant on the media and their operating principles, it is diachronic. For instance, journalism and the news media have a significant impact on how people now "do politics," not simply how political themes are presented. Today, media are present at every level of society, from "the big society" level, which includes the government and dominating societal organisations, to "the small society" level, which includes a wide variety of everyday interactions between people and groups in unstructured social contexts. They now serve as a natural resource for activities such as "doing family," "doing work," "doing sports," etc. The synchronic aspect of mediatization draws attention to the ways the media has shaped social interaction. The interactions between people, groups, and organisations are co-structured by media logics, which work exactly as a conditioning element that facilitates, restricts, and co-structures social interaction rather than as a deciding force. The term "media logics" is pluralized to show that there isn't a single logic underlying all forms of media.

According to mediatization examines the many ways that technology, aesthetics, and the institutional aspects of media interact to shape broad cultural and social issues. The goal of mediatization research is not to supplant current theory by fortifying it with a closed theoretical fortress. It should be viewed as an effort to provide a synthesising viewpoint that

should include findings from earlier studies, particularly those on the political economics of the media and the public sphere theory. Political economics is significant because social networking sites have a worldwide, commercial business model that is only loosely governed by politics. The previous structure of the mass media was based on a national public-private mix model with varying levels often high of domestic political influence. Public sphere theory is particularly significant because Jürgen Habermas' investigation of the structural transformation of the public sphere, which serves as an example of mediatization research, can be seen as a precursor to mediatization studies. Habermas attempted to combine historical and sociological approaches to investigate the restructuring of societal spheres.

According to the mediatization theory, social network media are involved in societal and cultural shifts that reshape institutions and social realms, including the public sphere in general and the institutional and technological underpinnings that enable the public sphere to function in reality. In the Nordic nations, a mix of PSM institutions (initially monopolies) and private news media, usually commercial, has supported the public realm. However, international, commercial players, particularly those from Facebook and Google, are having an expanding impact on the public sphere in every nation. Existing institutional frameworks are being partially destroyed and remade via mediatization processes.

Using examples like "friends" and social conventions like politeness, Dijck (2013) underlines how social network media are creating new types of sociality by fusing these concepts with algorithmic operating principles like popularity rankings (based on "likes," network size, etc.). Prior distinctions between public and private forms of communication, as well as between strategic and non-strategic forms, are being eroded as a result of this reorganisation of social interaction. On Facebook, a lot of communication has a mixed-character that is both private and public. Facebook provides information on current events that is transmitted via social dialogues among a person's own network of near and distant friends.

As a result, social network media's logics are different from those of mainstream media. Four social network media logics are highlighted by Dijck and Pool (2013): programmability, popularity, connectedness, and datafication. These are guiding principles, in their opinion, that increasingly interact with mass media logics as well as social network interactions. The logics of many or previously various media grow entwined and interconnected as mass media and social network media merge in many respects, including technically, economically, and via everyday usage. Sharing news from professional media, like PSM's news services, via social network media is obviously influenced by this tangle of logics. Sharing news with "friends" is seen from the user's viewpoint as a regular social interaction. The creation of shareable content has evolved into a strategic objective for the news industry. The ability of a news story to generate momentum on social media has become an internalised measure of a story's "quality" in newsrooms. User engagement and news media content are both essential components of the social network media business model.

A new framework for discussing public affairs is produced by the interactional norms of the real world, the logics of news media, and the logics of social network media. The methods through which individuals disseminate and debate news on social media includeAccording to Marwick and Boyd (2010), this environment is typified by a 'context collapse' that obscures the user's current social position. We are presenting a dynamic scenario that has implications for how individuals interact with news and conduct conversations. This poses a significant

challenge for PSM and other traditional legacy news outlets because social network media not only pose new threats to their historical dominance of audiences, revenue, and political legitimacy, but also demonstrate a different method of creating "publicness" than that used in the broadcast era. PSM must think about how to include people in public affairs under new networked circumstances as the techno-social architecture of the public realm constantly changes.

Numerous studies have shown that social network media are not necessarily appropriate for such debates, despite the claimed democratic potential of social network media to engage people in conversation about matters of shared concern and public interest. This is particularly true for contentious topics. In contrast to offline settings like the family dinner table, the workplace, or an open community gathering, individuals are less likely to address contentious subjects on social media, according to a Pew Research Centre research conducted in America in 2014. According to the study's findings, social media did not provide new forums for those who might otherwise remain silent to express their opinions and debate issues.Comparable research was done in Denmark in 2015 by the Danish Agency of Culture, which reached identical findings. In contrast to the 12 percent of Danes who would be "very willing" to do so in a public forum, just 6 percent of Danes would be "very willing" to discuss contentious matters on social media. Fully 25% of people would be "very willing" to talk about these topics at work, and 38% would do so during a family meal. According to a recent Norwegian research on citizens' readiness to debate the publishing of contentious religious cartoons, social media is not generally favoured by most people as a forum for such discussions.

As a result, it would seem that the notion that social networking sites serve as a public forum for communication for a'silent majority' that is otherwise mute is unfounded.The'spiral of silence' effect has been used to characterise people's reluctance to voice opposing viewpoints. The less ready one is to address contentious matters, the more one expects others to disagree or feels uncertain about their ideas. People with minority viewpoints are more inclined to abstain from expressing a contrasting perspective, which makes social network media possibly more likely to support majority opinions in a discussion. The absence of alternative voices makes like-minded individuals feel their opinions are more broadly, generally shared than reality, which causes hesitation and a spiral of silence. The spiral of silence is a characteristic of all forms of communication and is not unique to social network sites. Additional explanatory elements are required if we are to understand why individuals avoid debating contentious topics on social media. There are undoubtedly more, but I will only mention two here.

The aforementioned "context collapse" produces a hazy social setting that lessens the predictability of other participants' possible replies, including doubt about who one is truly chatting to in social network media. The platform and context of social network media may therefore push users to preserve face in the eyes of "friends" with a range of backgrounds and ties to the user, which might lead to a greater prevalence of the spiral of silence effect. Context collapse is more likely as a result of the algorithmic drive by Facebook and other social network media to expand the user's network. This often results in networks that are not only broader but also more diverse. The impact of this on political activity among (even) young politicians in Norway, who often utilise social networking sites to conduct political events, is supported by a research by Storsul (2014). The findings suggests that they were

hesitant to voice their political opinions on Facebook. Additionally, this environment's mixed social backdrop "causes teenagers to delimit controversies and try to keep political discussions to groups with more segregated audiences" Therefore, the first point is that social networking sites have an equal chance of exacerbating the spiral of silence issue as they do of possibly resolving it**.**

## CONCLUSION

As networks of optimism and pessimism influence attitudes, beliefs, and behaviours, they have major effects on both people and society. Promoting beneficial and constructive networks that promote wellbeing and social change requires an understanding of these networks' dynamics.Social networks are very important in influencing people's attitudes and ideas. People who have optimistic outlooks, hopeful attitudes, and optimistic viewpoints make up networks of optimism. These networks may support a person's resilience, drive, and feeling of wellbeing. Negative outlooks, pessimistic attitudes, and a concentration on constraints and barriers, on the other hand, characterise networks of pessimism. These networks may induce hopelessness, helplessness, and negative emotions.

**REFERENCES:**

[1] A. Rego, M. P. e. Cunha, D. Reis Júnior, C. Anastácio, en M. Savagnago, "The optimism-pessimism ratio as predictor of employee creativity: the promise of duality", *Eur. J. Innov. Manag.*, 2018, doi: 10.1108/EJIM-07-2017-0087.

[2] J. M. Felt *et al.*, "A multimethod approach examining the relative contributions of optimism and pessimism to cardiovascular disease risk markers", *J. Behav. Med.*, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s10865-020-00133-6.

[3] G. N. Marshall, C. B. Wortman, J. W. Kusulas, L. K. Hervig, en R. R. Vickers, "Distinguishing Optimism From Pessimism: Relations to Fundamental Dimensions of Mood and Personality", *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.*, 1992, doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.62.6.1067.

[4] M. D. Barnett, E. A. Anderson, en A. D. Marsden, "Is death anxiety more closely linked with optimism or pessimism among older adults?", *Arch. Gerontol. Geriatr.*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.archger.2018.05.003.

[5] H. Craig, R. Freak-Poli, A. Z. Z. Phyo, J. Ryan, en D. Gasevic, "The association of optimism and pessimism and all-cause mortality: A systematic review", *Pers. Individ. Dif.*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2021.110788.

[6] G. Arslan, M. Yıldırım, A. Tanhan, M. Buluş, en K. A. Allen, "Coronavirus Stress, Optimism-Pessimism, Psychological Inflexibility, and Psychological Health: Psychometric Properties of the Coronavirus Stress Measure", *Int. J. Ment. Health Addict.*, 2021, doi: 10.1007/s11469-020-00337-6.

[7] G. Arslan en M. Yıldırım, "Coronavirus stress, meaningful living, optimism, and depressive symptoms: a study of moderated mediation model", *Aust. J. Psychol.*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/00049530.2021.1882273.

[8] K. Asimakopoulou *et al.*, "Comparative optimism about infection and recovery from COVID-19; Implications for adherence with lockdown advice", *Heal. Expect.*, 2020, doi: 10.1111/hex.13134.

[9] A. Maftei en A. C. Holman, “Cyberchondria During the Coronavirus Pandemic: The Effects of Neuroticism and Optimism”, *Front. Psychol.*, 2020, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.567345.

# CHAPTER 7

# PUBLIC SERVICE OBLIGATIONS FOR SOCIAL NETWORK MEDIA

Devi Prabha A.
Assistant Professor, Department of Law,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id:deviprabha@presidencyuniversity.in

**ABSTRACT:**

The idea of public service obligations (PSOs) for social media platforms, as well as their function in advancing societal advantages. It looks at how social media companies must prioritise serving the public good above their own financial interests. In the research, prospective PSOs for social network media platforms are explored, including how to deal with false information, safeguard user privacy, support a variety of viewpoints, and stop online abuse. In the context of social network media, it also analyses the difficulties and possibilities associated with adopting and regulating PSOs. This study intends to add to the current debate on the obligations of social network media platforms in building a healthier and more inclusive digital public sphere by examining the idea of PSOs.

**KEYWORDS:**

Diversity, Public Interest,Public Service Obligations, Social Network Media,User Privacy.

## INTRODUCTION

By using curated material, PSM may do a lot by commissioning and purchasing content on the open market rather of having to create all of the content internally. It is significant to note that in the aforementioned instances, both the broadcaster and the production business showed dedication to public service ideals. This shows that curating includes both the curation of material for social network media as well as the curation of content inside and by social network media, using the crowdsourcing capabilities of the network. The two examples' success hinged on PSM's capacity to foster cooperation between offline and online contributions[1], [2].Second, PSM contributes significantly via moderation. There are many different ways to communicate and converse on social media. Generally speaking, sociability refers to communication that is done largely for social purposes and to strengthen bonds with others.

Another prevalent kind of communication is strategic communication, in which commercial and political interests use internet postings that resemble friendly forms of contact between "friends" to try to sway public opinion and conduct. Social network platforms must go beyond the convivial and tactical types of communication that are now dominant if they are to be useful for addressing public issues. Talk, particularly social talk, may be utilised for a number of objectives, including authoritarian or democratic, manipulative or deliberative, as convincingly stated by Schudson (1997). He contends that in order for democratic dialogues to be successful, they must be committed to openness and decency. In other words, moderation is necessary for democratic discourse on social network media platforms. This is true in the restricted sense of checking postings for hate speech as well as in the more general sense of proactively preparing to assure the quality of the discussion by asking appropriate

people to join the discussion to ensure a diversity of views and opinions, etc. This shows that PSM has a contextualising function[3], [4].

Finally, PSM may be quite important in monitoring. Social media platforms may be a valuable source for a broad variety of information that is relevant to both the public and the private sectors, but the more necessary it is that this information flow is subject to scrutiny and quality control, the more important they become as information distributors. As a result of worries about the growth of "fake news," news media companies are stepping up fact-checking practises, and political organisations are urging social networking sites to implement policies to combat different types of disinformation. Before the national elections in France and Germany, for instance, Facebook announced additional measures, and starting in 2018, the German NetzDG legislation would impose stronger regulations on hate speech and false news on social media. These activities could be beneficial, but they shouldn't be restricted to press coverage and post-publication passive damage management. Governmental service media should play a proactive role as monitoring institutions that verify and validate information and try to differentiate between relevant and less relevant information, together with other knowledge-processing organisations like universities, governmental institutions, and NGOs.

Increased visibility and vigilant supervision in the social network media realm would not only make it more difficult for dubious material to proliferate, but would also establish guidelines for what constitutes reliable information. This position would be in line with the traditional PSB duty to act as a barometer for quality standards[5], [6]. Although PSM groups are not the only ones that can do these three public service activities, they have relatively specialised expertise and professional experience that allow them to do so today. Additionally, these three responsibilities provide a framework for moving forward with a goal of enabling people to more effectively utilise social networking sites as tools for producing and disseminating information and conversations about public concerns.Social network media offer this potential, but in the absence of democratic control, disinformation may proliferate, spiralling silence has negative impacts, and financial pressures can undermine this potential.

The worldwide sway that powerful digital firms like Facebook and Google have in the world of social network media presents a serious challenge to the notion of democratic government. Only a small number of the dominating players' behaviours are impacted by national political regulation and national public service institution activities. Up until now, most national policy actions have been reactive rather than proactive in light of technology and commercial advancements.It is obvious that supranational involvement, for instance at the level of the European Union, is required to govern the social network media practises of large computer businesses. The European Union seems to be one of the only supranational organisations that has shown some willingness to interact with the expanding influence of multinational IT giants so far. However, by making deliberate efforts to filter material, control debates, and monitor social network media, national public service media and other organisations, such as civil society organisations aiming to increase public interest in media, may make a difference[7], [8].

We are once again seeing a structural restructuring of the public sphere via mediatization processes, along with other processes, particularly those involving globalisation and

commercialization (Habermas 1989). Relationships between personal, private, and public spheres, as well as between strategic, deliberative, and convivial modes of communication, are being restructured by social network media. To secure the public interest advantages for societies as a whole, it is crucial to subject them to public service requirements given their expanding prominence as disseminators of publicly important information and venues for public interaction. Due to historical, legal, and institutional factors, this mandate is natural for PSM; as a result, it may be seen as an urgent, modern responsibility that is crucial to PSM's function in the networked society.

## DISCUSSION

Sociologists often emphasise the advantages of communication inside and between transnational groups when discussing the potential for the so-called networked society. According to Castells (1996), the introduction of VCR technology and the growth of cable TV heralded the demise of mass audiences and their replacement with "segmented, differentiated audiences" in terms of the simultaneity and uniformity of the messages they consume. In contrast to unidirectional mass media, Castells saw the emergence of empowered people utilising interactive media.Eli Noam (1995) also stressed the influence of "cyber-TV" with "me-channels" on individualization. Competition for frequencies, channels, and content is less important than fighting for customers' attention when media markets go through significant structural changes. Noam anticipated the swift entry of new companies in a disruptive environment and questioned if US productions would rule in developing international TV markets.

He provided a response to his query only 10 years later, stating that "Internet TV will be strongly American" (Noam 2004: 242). In fact, this describes the worldwide internet video business, where Netflix and Amazon have established themselves as leaders and are already releasing localised in-house films.Globalisation and individualization have therefore unquestionably come to pass. Noam also mentioned a third anticipation of fresh socialising outcomes. He thought that via cyber-TV and loosely defined "telecommunities," the shared mass audience television experience that previously forged a link might be replicated. The Usenet's early experience in cyberspace made it reasonable to assume that peer-to-peer interactions would expand. He could not have predicted the rise of peer-to-peer middleman platforms or the concept of sharing as a commodity. Content remains crucial, without a doubt, but the middleman who equalises all content may be said to beking.The rise of digital infrastructures in broadcast media has been the key point of contention in talks about the future of PSM for more than twenty years. Digital technology is relatively new, but broadcasting is not. An intricate web of interconnected systems for production, storage, and dissemination adaptation have been the emphasis, with important ramifications for workflows and jobs. But if broadcasting as a whole loses importance, this emphasis becomes less and less helpful.

Unfortunately, media regulation lags behind the growing technological and business revolution, leaving PSM with particular concerns about their place in future national and international media systems. In all Western cultures, younger generations (those under the age of 45) are progressively turning away from linear media, which is significant given how viewers act differently nowadays. Even older generations are using smartphones as mobile

media devices, demonstrating the depth and breadth of the disruption. Along with this risk comes the possibility that PSM may lose political and public support.

It's uncertain if PSM and other established "quality media" providers will remain relevant.They are likely to lose their historical significance in daily life unless they are able to play a similar substantial role in online domains as they have in conventional media systems. Although they are not utilised as often or frequently as they once were, they are still trusted. The internet and its intermediate platforms provide a wide range of subjects and points of view, but they do so with the emphasis on public service and social responsibility that the conventional press and broadcasters favoured. This should be reason for alarm. The previously ideal public realm is becoming divided into multiple communication spaces without a shared or common aim. Not only is the media being disrupted, but also the fundamental Western social institutions of friendship, participation, sharing, openness, and discourse. Under the circumstances of modern digital communication, digital economics, and digital cultures, all of this has to be redefined. It is necessary to discuss how far the media disruption process has progressed, how it will effect PSM now and in the future, and with what ramifications. Re-visionary interpretations of the public enterprise in media are what RIPE is all about, and they are definitely needed today.

There are already some viable early solutions. If public broadcasters as such do not establish themselves as an integral part of the younger generation's culture, which is punctuated by the usage of personal mobile media, they risk losing this demographic. Some radio stations have taken note of this lesson, but TV programming mainly ignores it and PSM online and mobile activities outside of broadcast-related services only partially demonstrate it. It is doubtful that the online approach of many PSM companies will be successful as long as "online" is seen as a supplementary, supplemental distribution channel for previously generated linear material. Success in online media depends not only on content but also on the contribution to ongoing, intricate, and growing digital communication. Many, if not the most, PSM groups are still not playing a significant role on such platforms for a number of reasons.

In addition to being promoted by uneven market shares between broadcast and web, the issue is also brought on by a broadcasting mindset. It helps to provide an example to illustrate. Around 35% of the market share for evening transmission belongs to the German news show Tagesschau. Together with the websites and applications of the second German public network ZDF, all of the ARD network's websites, to which Tagesschau belongs, account for 11.7% of all German online information offers. Additionally, competitors have a commanding position of leadership in the internet sector, accounting for 52.8% of print publishers and trailing PSM by only 7.8% of commercial TV news and information websites. This upsets the normal scales of intramedia and intermedia connections. Audience habits and historical trust may not simply transfer to new media settings. As internet and mobile media develop, PSM must demonstrate their relevance. They at least need to become more relevant to offset their loss in linear media contexts, which is crucial given the generational divide already mentioned.

For PSM, demonstrating their particular value for public communication is required as evidence of relevance. Without it, PSM legitimacy is likely doomed. Their credibility is based on their relationships with viewers as well as the quality material they produce that no one else can. So, measuring relevance must address a fundamental issue. Such quantitative

metrics would miss the point notwithstanding limitations that prevent PSM from fully using internet monitoring tools to the amount generally utilised by commercial platforms, and for good reasons. Clicks, shares, likes, and retweets are examples of user interactions with interface components that cannot be reasonably understood as measures of the usefulness of public media channels for and to the public.

Although they may reflect them, the interfaces of web applications facilitate man-machine interactions rather than cultural values. At the same time, values and views are transitory declarations in a dynamic process created by a sophisticated network of media and interpersonal interactions. Given this, other sources for proving relevance for PSM must be discovered. That won't be simple. For instance, a survey of news sources among young people in Germany indicated that, although being the most dependable source, PSM news is only used to a limited extent (JIM 2014). A market survey or profile and tracking data analysis cannot determine the importance of a specific political stance or cultural trend in a person's day-to-day existence. There is always a chance that a message was spread more for its amusement value than to promote the point of view its author was trying to make. As most journalists are aware, a subject that is widely discussed or seen to be "trending" may not really be very relevant. The degree of attention varies depending on the scenario and the gadget, as was already mentioned. Audience retention rates are not a suitable substitute, and such disparities are difficult to quantify in research. This is not a blanket defence against the use of statistical data to provide insights about how users interact with programmes, online services, materials, or applications. It is only being noted that such data cannot be used to evaluate user loyalty, trust, or consequences that involve comprehending complicated settings and circumstances[9], [10].

Print publishing, commercial broadcasting, public service broadcasting, or any other conventional mass media industry, digital change is difficult to manage. However, there are unique challenges in making the transition to PSM. These groups can face legal restrictions that prevent them from developing websites, particularly in Europe where transnational and national legislation impose imposed immobility in crucial areas. PSM entities continue to have a mission that is primarily focused on broadcasting, with varying extra funding for internet operations. An integrated mission and remit are needed to handle the growth of DMC. Such a mandate must be media-neutral in terms of technology and centre on the duty to create and disseminate public value across all suitable media platforms. Legal issues are a significant issue, particularly in Germany, yet they are the only issue preventing the digital transition from being completely PSM. Other factors include the leadership of PSM firms lacking desire and having insufficient organisational competencies. The self-concept of these businesses might sometimes stand in the way of effective reform. For a variety of reasons, efforts to establish integrated communication ideas that are crucial to relevance, competence, and value in networked digital media environments i.e., the digital media culture are prioritised above attempts to produce TV and increase TV audience shares. Then, in this context, we examine potential behavioural patterns.

After the early years, there was varying degrees of support for publicly funded digital services, but EU governance remained typically steadfast. While some broadcasting enterprises, both public and private, such as the BBC in Britain and Yle in Finland, saw the importance of this, in many instances their leaders lacked the long-term vision to see the benefits of investing heavily in these'side' operations. The window of opportunity closed

when press publishers launched an offensive in response to the sharp decrease in ad turnover, particularly in Germany and the UK, which have bigger media markets. The state-aid compromise of 2005–2007 is largely explained by the PSM interpretation of unlawful market distortion. In Germany specifically, public broadcasters' online material is increasingly being limited to services connected to their programming, and what is provided online must be distinct from what is provided by the press and its digital offshoots.The fight for PSM mostly took place inside national borders at the same time as these companies experienced a thorough transformation that prioritised digital networks. The concept of "networked societies" provides a positive outlook that underlines individuals' assumed liberty and sovereignty.

## CONCLUSION

PSOs for social network media platforms are essential for advancing societal advantages and guaranteeing that the public interest is given priority. Social network media platforms may help create a more wholesome and inclusive digital public sphere by upholding these standards.PSOs for social network media platforms are responsible for a variety of tasks. In order to actively stop the spread of inaccurate or misleading information that may damage people and society, platforms must actively address disinformation. Another crucial requirement for platforms is to protect user privacy by ensuring the safe management of personal data and giving users access to their data.

## REFERENCES:

[1] J. Abreu, X. Fageda, en J. L. Jiménez, “An empirical evaluation of changes in Public Service Obligations in Spain”, *J. Air Transp. Manag.*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.jairtraman.2017.11.001.

[2] M. Hromádka, “Definition of public service obligation potential in the new EU member states”, *Transp. Probl.*, 2017, doi: 10.20858/tp.2017.12.1.1.

[3] A. M. Raya en V. M. González-Sánchez, “Tender management relating to imposition of public service obligations on scheduled air routes: An approach involving digital transformation of procurement procedures in Spain”, *Sustain.*, 2020, doi: 10.3390/su12135322.

[4] F. Leandro, A. R. Andrade, en S. Kalakou, “Designing aviation networks under Public Service Obligations (PSO): A case study in Greece”, *J. Air Transp. Manag.*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.jairtraman.2021.102042.

[5] M. I. Ansari, “Stateowned Enterprise And Public Service Obligation In The Sector Of Oil And Gas”, *Mimb. Huk. - Fak. Huk. Univ. Gadjah Mada*, 2018, doi: 10.22146/jmh.23643.

[6] J. Blaž, K. Zajc, S. Zupan, en M. Ambrož, “Evaluation System for the Implementation of Public Passenger Transport as a Public Service Obligation”, *Sustainability*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/su11123294.

[7] J. Butkevičius, “The strategy of passenger transportation by national railway transport: The implementation of public service obligations”, *Transport*, 2009, doi: 10.3846/1648-4142.2009.24.180-186.

[8] J. M. M. Osante, “Territorial cohesion and air transport in Spain”, *Cuad. Derecho Transnacional*, 2020, doi: 10.20318/cdt.2020.5620.

[9] J. Trischler, T. Dietrich, en S. Rundle-Thiele, “Co-design: from expert- to user-driven ideas in public service design”, *Public Manag. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/14719037.2019.1619810.

[10] L. O. Anto, Husin, W. Hamid, en N. L. Bulan, “Taxpayer awareness, tac knowledge, tac sanctions, public service account ability and taxpayer compliance”, *Accounting*, 2021, doi: 10.5267/j.ac.2020.10.015.

# CHAPTER 8
# A STUDY ON INDIVIDUAL VERSUS MEDIA: SMALL VERSUS LARGE

Razina Ahmed
Assistant Professor, Department of Law,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id:razina.ahmed@presidencyuniversity.in

**ABSTRACT:**

The dynamic between small and big enterprises in the context of media impact, as well as the interaction between the person and the media. Although the influence of media on public perception and opinion has long been recognised, the development of digital platforms has increased this influence, creating a complicated dynamic between people and media sources. The power dynamics, information flow, and possible outcomes of this interaction are all examined in this paper. This study clarifies the potential and problems inherent in this connection by examining the viewpoints of both the person and the media.

**KEYWORDS:**

Individual, Information Dissemination Media, Power Dynamics, Small, Large Organization.

## INTRODUCTION

Regarding how these organisations could regard their integration or lack thereof into the network society, two more PSB components are pertinent. The first is that, as was already said, they are and have always been mass media companies. A disdain for mainstream media is a resounding characteristic of most of the early talk about the network society. Being Digital by Nicholas Negroponte, published in 1995, is a noteworthy but common example.the infamous prediction that "media barons of today will be grasping to hold on to their centralised empires tomorrow" and that "what will happen to broadcast television over the next five years is so phenomenal that it's difficult to comprehend[1], [2].

It is simple to make fun of these forecasts now, 22 years later, as Henry Jenkins did. Time Warner and Disney, as well as the media empires founded by Rupert Murdoch and Sumner Redstone as well as the BBC, NHK, ZDF, and other organisations, are all still operating in August 2017. Negroponte made the common error of anticipating that the emergence of a new form of media will replace the old rather than anticipating its coexistence and reflexive development the precise argument Jenkins addresses in his convergence thesis. The ubiquitous anti-mass media rhetoric of the early new media evangelists, albeit obvious in retrospect, would logically prompt PSB organisations along with their commercial counterparts to worry about having any future in a network society to the degree that they stayed in the industry[3], [4].

Negroponte made a perceptive point about the inefficiency of using the broadcasting-derived concept of "narrowcasting" to think through potential developments in the network society, setting aside the fact that Google and Facebook have since developed massively successful business models using the digital activities of me. For broadcasters and other mass media firms, both commercial and public, that method of exploring network society prospects came

most easily. It should thus come as no surprise that the majority of significant new advances in network society media have come from start-ups rather than reputable mainstream media corporations, notwithstanding notable outliers such as iPlayer at the BBC. PSB has never been about mainly satisfying the individual interests of people, but rather on addressing the broad, common often presumptive requirements of society as a whole. Media 1.0 was that. This point of view is ingrained in PSB operations and organisational directives[5], [6].This suggests that PSM groups are not well suited to succeed in the setting of the network society. They are not tiny start-ups; in fact, major mass media players often see small start-ups as a significant danger and arguably even a greater threat than established national commercial media businesses. PSB companies, on the other hand, have little to no possibility to gain from global concentration, which is tremendously advantageous to bigger national commercial media businesses. Even if PSB's brand is often a strength at home, it is nevertheless limited to the national market. However, unlike their commercial rivals, they are politically restrained from modernising themselves by purchasing or funding start-ups. Thus, the rhetoric surrounding the network society and much of the reality have been especially unconducive to PSB having a beneficial role from the very beginnings of the network society as a considerable reality since the 1990s.

The creation of digital terrestrial television (DTT) was one of the rare instances when (neo-liberal) governments did briefly toy with the idea of giving PSB groups a constructive role in creating the network society. In the middle of the 1990s, many observers lacked faith that the 'information superhighway' (the internet) would be adopted by the vast majority of people instead of just a relatively tiny elite of educated and young people. DTT, for instance, was briefly considered an alternative to the information superhighway in the UK and Italy. Despite an early preference by the UK government for commercial broadcasters, PSB groups turned out to be somewhat more successful in addressing the development of DTT. This "alternative route" was dropped, nevertheless, when domestic internet penetration grew quickly without encountering the predicted impediments[6], [7].

**Several public service broadcasting successes**

PSB groups have done three things that have made a beneficial influence in the early phases of network society growth without very much official backing - and sometimes against blatant government rejection.The number of channels PSB operates on has first expanded in the burgeoning multichannel environment created by satellitecable, and digital terrestrial delivery.The majority, if not all, have created specialised channels, such as news channels, kid's channels, and even overseas networks. Second, they have often been forerunners in the early development of websites to promote their traditional programming and to provide another avenue for their frequently highly regarded news and other programming services, much like their newspaper counterparts in the mass media. Ironically, however, this has put them in very direct rivalry as suppliers of online news with commercial newspaper publishers, which has caused significant complications with competition regulators. Third, and more lately, PSB organisations have led the way in developing web-based "catch up" services (like the BBC iPlayer), breaking away from the linear broadcasting paradigm (albeit sometimes ahead of commercial broadcasters).But there are a few factors to keep in mind regarding these PSB accomplishments. All of these advancements are crucially connected to PSB's conventional broadcast mandate. The primary goods and services are the emphasis, but in more adaptable and diversified forms[8], [9].

Furthermore, these advancements were made without the addition of new income. Financial difficulties have resulted from this, and some of the projects, especially those that included foreign countries, were created more as money generators than as public services in the traditional sense.Due to these discrepancies, the credibility of the PSB is at stake. Last but not least, some of these endeavorssuch as news websites or placing conventional PSB educational activities online—were limited because they were seen as 'unfair competition' or'stifling business initiative' by both commercial adversaries and neo-liberal governments. In some situations, they have actually been discontinued, as was the case with the BBC's online educational programme (BBC Jam), which the BBC Trust discontinued after a year due to objections from business competitors.

## DISCUSSION

the already mentioned impediments have limited even PSB's early triumphs in the setting of the network society. Since 2000, the network society has rapidly developed in terms of its capacity for and dispersion of internet access, as well as its quality (particularly thanks to broadband). The quality and popularity of internet-enabled gadgets have greatly improved, notably with the introduction of smartphones and the emergence of social media. Although 'Web 2.0' in theory offered a vast array of prospects for PSM growth, the limiting limitations we have described prevented this promise from being realised in reality. Furthermore, strong new elements were added to these existing ones. Two well-known and significant books on Web 2.0 provided examples of what was novel.The subject of this chapter's discussion is influenced by Henry Jenkins' 2006 book Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide and Clay Shirky's 2008 book Here Comes Everybody: How Change Happens When People Come Together.Both start with tales to highlight and explain the points they are making (tidily summarised in their separate subtitles). Jenkins' opening tells the tale of a high school student who used Photoshop to combine Osama Bin Laden with a Sesame Street character. He then posted the image on his homepage as part of a series he called "Bert is Evil," and a Bangladeshi publisher used it to create anti-American signs, posters, and T-shirts. CNN then documented the incident and aired it.

differing perspectives on the new networked world that they both identified, but they both underlined the bottom-up participatory culture that the new environment fosters. As their remarks on the different starting case studies demonstrate, neither was oblivious of the issues such a participative culture can bring about. But this was valued and celebrated overall in their works. However, PSB makes it seem like Jenkins' and Shirky's introductory tales are rather unlike.Both writers provide quite extreme examples of the dangers that PSB can encounter if they participate in this culture of participation. These might include, to mention a few, copyright violations, advocating for vigilante justice or bigotry, and affiliation with terrorism. This is a particularly terrifying image for PSB for two reasons. First, since PSB has always valued top-down accountability. Controversial topics are sent to higher-ups and, where feasible, avoided.Second, while the cultural revolutions of the 1960s and 1970s led to some relaxation of legacy attitudes and structures, PSB groups have been politically vulnerable organisations in recent years because they are aware that any "slip" might have severe political (and financial) repercussions. Engaging in the bottom-up participatory cultures praised by Jenkins and Shirky will necessarily increase the likelihood of such "slips" occurring by removing control from their hands.

**Reclaiming Digital Space**

The extravagant celebration of imagined Britishness that served as the 2012 London Olympics' opening ceremony reflects the nation's shift from industrial to digital capitalism in one of its most iconic sequences. Isambard Brunel, the chief architect of the trains, bridges, and iron ships that provided the linking backbone for the new industrial system, ruled over a congested scene of factory chimneys and molten metal that gives way to a simple cube in an otherwise vacant place. Tim Berners-Lee, the creator of the World Wide Web, the invisible digital network that has emerged as a crucial support for individual, business, and governmental activities in the new capitalism, is the lone inhabitant. 'This is for Everyone' was written on a lit banner that circled the stadium behind him.

The Berners-Lee vision's central promise was universality. In order to enable anyone, anywhere, to navigate the vast array of sites that are available and "to put anything on the Web no matter what computer they have, software they use, or human language they speak," as he explained on the Web's twentieth anniversary in 2010, he set out to create a system. This design approach supports new horizontal linkages and new vertical distribution channels, which are supported by the larger complex of professional and consumer digital technologies that are reorganising access and production.The open source software movement was the first significant endeavour to use digital networking to investigate new types of cooperation. It was established in reaction to the expanding dominance of proprietary software, which is managed by for-profit companies under the leadership of Microsoft, and it welcomed programmers to participate in the creation of a portfolio of openly available alternatives. Wikipedia, which invited anybody who wants to share their expertise on a certain subject to contribute to a global online encyclopaedia that could be continuously updated, came after this in 2001. Both ventures relied on peer-to-peer transactions supported by the "gift economy," which advocates reciprocity. Contributors gave their time and knowledge freely, but they also placed a moral duty on those who benefited to repay these favours by adding their own resources to the pool of freely available ones. Both businesses paired up experts and novices. Hackers and software professionals both contributed.

A rising awareness that digital technology may assist in resolving issues encountered by museums, libraries, and other publicly financed cultural institutions was concurrent with the rise of horizontal networks of participation and cooperation.Firstly, digitalizing assets and resources boosted claims of providing value for money, which supported their claims on public financing, by liberating assessments of performance from past raw counts of visitor footfalls or audience attendance and broadening access. Second, digital archiving provided opportunity to respond to growing public demands that public collections contain vernacular materials that chronicled daily experience and spoke to the histories of disadvantaged groups by eliminating physical restrictions on storage and presentation.

However, it was evident early on in the Web's development that the major public cultural institutions did not view themselves as collections of resources within a larger network of provision, but rather as distinctive entities with their own distinct histories and methods of operation. Relevant information was dispersed among several websites, each with its own participation and access rules. As I considered this issue, I came to the conclusion that public service broadcasters had an exceptional opportunity to establish the foundation for a "digital commons" that would bring together the dynamism of voluntary participation and the

knowledge of seasoned cultural institutions. This opportunity could be demonstrated by integrating PSB with the open Web. This might result in a pool of freely accessible materials and chances for innovation, inclusivity, cooperation, self-development, and creativity that is unmatched.

First of all, we are seeing an accelerated enclosure of digital space, where power over everyday internet use is increasingly consolidated in the hands of businesses that have exclusive control over their core business activities.Search is dominated by Google. Use of social media is monopolised by Facebook. Amazon has taken control of internet shopping. Apple is a significant manufacturer of smartphones and tablets, which have replaced laptop computers as the preferred method of accessing the Internet. Public broadcasting is the sole viable defence against the growing commercial takeover of digital public life due to its continued integration into daily life. A networked society's democratic health and overall prosperity depend critically on this function. Second, PSB's goals have been scaled down at a time when a coordinated effort to create a comprehensive digital common is most required due to a combination of ongoing public funding cutbacks and a political environment based in a militant support of market competition. The future of popular culture is really in jeopardy if this keeps happening. Therefore, what occurs and does not occur has a major impact on the nature and standard of social life in networked societies.

**The rise and rise of digital majors**

When the Spry speech in 2004, neither Google nor Facebook had a significant impact on the digital world that was only beginning to take shape. Facebook was introduced in that year, and Google's business significantly expanded as the corporation released its first batch of shares to the general public. I didn't understand how quickly they would take over how people use the internet on a daily basis. I wasn't alone myself. The internet was seen by many observers at the time as a force for creative disruption, undermining established centres of power, replacing vertical hierarchies with horizontal planes of interaction, and supporting widening participation rather than entrenched domination. Many observers still held onto some romanticism from that time. Commentators acknowledged that fewer and fewer mega communication conglomerates were gaining control over the traditional print and audiovisual industries, and they viewed the internet as a decentralised system designed to distribute rather than consolidate power.

Between 1997 and 2001, a wave of speculative investments in brand-new dot.com businesses without a track record of profitability resulted from the initial excitement for the internet as the central node of a developing digital economy. When the dot-com bubble burst in 2001–2002, the level of competition was drastically lowered, opening up opportunities for a select few businesses like Google and Amazon that had weathered the crisis. Additionally, it allowed for the entry of new players with well-defined business goals, such as Mark Zuckerberg, the CEO of Facebook, who understood that he was joining the platform industry rather than the content business. He wasn't a factory owner; he was a landlord. Everything that appeared on the website, apart from advertisements, was contributed by users whose interests and social networks were watched and processed to provide data that could be sold to businesses looking to precisely target promotional pitches. The foundation of the business strategy was comprehensive, ongoing commercial monitoring, a theme I'll return to.

Once founded, the top players have benefited from a variety of factors, including network effects that drive individuals to join websites with the most users and financial resources that allow these companies to broaden the services they provide and acquire prospective rivals. The acquisition of YouTube by Google in 2006, the purchase of Instagram by Facebook in 2012, and the acquisition of WhatsApp in 2014 are all prime examples. The dominant corporation in each may advertise additional services at the cost of rivals due to a virtual monopoly in that area. Margarethe Vestager, the EU Competition Commissioner, declared in June 2017 that Google had "abused its market dominance as a search engine by promoting its own comparison shopping service in its search results, and demoting those of competitors," depriving "European consumers of a genuine choice of services". This was the result of a protracted investigation. The record fine for this illicit activity was 2.42 billion British pound.

## CONCLUSION

The interaction between small and big organisations, as well as the connection between people and the media, is a complex and ever-evolving dynamic. This research has shed light on a number of crucial facets of this interaction, offering understandings of the influence, information flow, and power dynamics at work.First off, the media, whether it be the mainstream media or smaller alternative channels, has a big influence on how the public feels and perceives things. Media outlets have the power to shape narratives, choose facts, and use persuasion to change people's opinions and actions. The increasing use of digital platforms, which provide quick and comprehensive information distribution, amplifies this impact even further.

## REFERENCES:

[1] C. Leung, “The difference in the incubation period of 2019 novel coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2) infection between travelers to Hubei and nontravelers: The need for a longer quarantine period”, *Infect. Control Hosp. Epidemiol.*, 2020, doi: 10.1017/ice.2020.81.

[2] W. Wang en I. Abosag, “Do immigration and social media facilitate or inhibit cognitive acculturation? The role of individual dialecticism in dual-focused cultural stimuli evaluation”, *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.techfore.2018.07.061.

[3] B. Dunst *et al.*, “Neural efficiency as a function of task demands”, *Intelligence*, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.intell.2013.09.005.

[4] R. Spears, “Social Influence and Group Identity”, *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2021. doi: 10.1146/annurev-psych-070620-111818.

[5] M. Wolfe, B. D. Jones, en F. R. Baumgartner, “A Failure to Communicate: Agenda Setting in Media and Policy Studies”, *Polit. Commun.*, 2013, doi: 10.1080/10584609.2012.737419.

[6] K. White *et al.*, “Motivations for Participation in an Online Social Media Community for Diabetes”, *J. Diabetes Sci. Technol.*, 2018, doi: 10.1177/1932296817749611.

[7] M. A. Oberhardt *et al.*, “Harnessing the landscape of microbial culture media to predict new organism-media pairings”, *Nat. Commun.*, 2015, doi: 10.1038/ncomms9493.

[8] H. Greijdanus *et al.*, “The psychology of online activism and social movements: relations between online and offline collective action”, *Current Opinion in Psychology*. 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.copsyc.2020.03.003.

[9] M. Boukes, A. Damstra, en R. Vliegenthart, “Media Effects Across Time and Subject: How News Coverage Affects Two Out of Four Attributes of Consumer Confidence”, *Communic. Res.*, 2021, doi: 10.1177/0093650219870087.

# CHAPTER 9
# MEDIATIZATION: NETWORKS OF SOCIAL CHANGE

Shreya
Assistant Professor, Department of Law,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id:shreya@presidencyuniversity.in

**ABSTRACT:**

The idea of mediatization and its function in social change networks. The term "mediatization" describes the ubiquitous impact of media on several facets of society, such as social movements, activism, and grassroots projects. This research looks at how media outlets and communication tools influence and support social change networks. This study intends to shed light on the transformational potential of media in nurturing social movements and advancing social change by analysing the processes, dynamics, and consequences of mediatization.

**KEYWORDS:**

Communication TechnologiesNetwork, Mediatization, Media Platforms, Social Change.

## INTRODUCTION

The mediatization theory offers a crucial all-encompassing viewpoint on the connections between media, broader culture, and social situations. This viewpoint transfers the focus from communication processes of "mediation" the use of different media for communication to social processes of "mediatization" changes in the larger culture and society as a result of the media's increasing presence and influence. The vast corpus of study on how media messages may impact audiences or shape public opinion shows that most studies have traditionally situated media influence at the level of communication processes. Although a crucial component of media's effect, this viewpoint is inadequate due to the media's pervasiveness in an ever-growing number of spheres of cultural and social life. The integration of diverse media into the very fabric of culture and society is emphasised by mediatization theory as a significant impact in and of itself. Politics, religion, and sports are just a few of the many facets and areas of society where media has become essential to society's functioning. Consequently, media have an impact on society since they are essential instruments for social relations[1], [2].

Both a synchronic and a diachronic aspect of culture and society are mediated. Because mediatization is a historical and transformational process that makes other social domains more reliant on the media and their operating principles, it is diachronic. For instance, journalism and the news media have a significant impact on how people now "do politics," not simply how political themes are presented. Today, media are present at every level of society, from "the big society" level, which includes the government and dominating societal organisations, to "the small society" level, which includes a wide variety of everyday interactions between people and groups in unstructured social contexts. They now serve as a natural resource for activities such as "doing family," "doing work," "doing sports," etc.The synchronic aspect of mediatization draws attention to the ways the media has shaped social interaction. The interactions between people, groups, and organisations are co-structured by

media logics, which work exactly as a conditioning element that facilitates, restricts, and co-structures social interaction rather than as a deciding force.

The term "media logics" is pluralized to show that there isn't a single logic underlying all forms of media. According to Hjarvard, mediatization examines the many ways that technology, aesthetics, and the institutional aspects of media interact to shape broad cultural and social issues. The goal of mediatization research is not to supplant current theory by fortifying it with a closed theoretical fortress. It should be viewed as an effort to provide a synthesising viewpoint that should include findings from earlier studies, particularly those on the political economics of the media and the public sphere theory. Political economics is significant because social networking sites have a worldwide, commercial business model that is only loosely governed by politics. The previous structure of the mass media was based on a national public-private mix model with varying levels often high of domestic political influence. Public sphere theory is particularly significant because Jürgen Habermas' investigation of the structural transformation of the public sphere, which serves as an example of mediatization research, can be seen as a precursor to mediatization studies. Habermas attempted to combine historical and sociological approaches to investigate the restructuring of societal spheres[3], [4]. According to the mediatization theory, social network media are involved in societal and cultural shifts that reshape institutions and social realms, including the public sphere in general and the institutional and technological underpinnings that enable the public sphere to function in reality. In the Nordic nations, a mix of PSM institutions initially monopolies and private news media, usually commercial, has supported the public realm.

However, international, commercial players, particularly those from Facebook and Google, are having an expanding impact on the public sphere in every nation. Existing institutional frameworks are being partially destroyed and remade via mediatization processes.Using examples like "friends" and social conventions like politeness, Dijck (2013) underlines how social network media are creating new types of sociality by fusing these concepts with algorithmic operating principles like popularity rankings based on "likes," network size, etc.). Prior distinctions between public and private forms of communication, as well as between strategic and non-strategic forms, are being eroded as a result of this reorganisation of social interaction. On Facebook, a lot of communication has a mixed-character that is both private and public. Facebook provides information on current events that is transmitted via social dialogues among a person's own network of near and distant friends[5], [6].

As a result, social network media's logics are different from those of mainstream media. Four social network media logics are highlighted by Dijck and Pool (2013): programmability, popularity, connectedness, and datafication. These are guiding principles, in their opinion, that increasingly interact with mass media logics as well as social network interactions. The logics of many or previously various media grow entwined and interconnected as mass media and social network media merge in many respects, including technically, economically, and via everyday usage. Sharing news from professional media, like PSM's news services, via social network media is obviously influenced by this tangle of logics. Sharing news with "friends" is seen from the user's viewpoint as a regular social interaction. The creation of shareable content has evolved into a strategic objective for the news industry. The ability of a news story to generate momentum on social media has become an internalised measure of a

story's "quality" in newsrooms. User engagement and news media content are both essential components of the social network media business model[6], [7].

## DISCUSSION

A new framework for discussing public affairs is produced by the interactional norms of the real world, the logics of news media, and the logics of social network media. This mixed-public and mixed-private social milieu has an impact on how individuals share and debate news on social network platforms.this environment is typified by a 'context collapse' that obscures the user's current social position. We are presenting a dynamic scenario that has implications for how individuals interact with news and conduct conversations. This poses a significant challenge for PSM and other traditional legacy news outlets because social network media not only pose new threats to their historical dominance of audiences, revenue, and political legitimacy, but also demonstrate a different method of creating "publicness" than that used in the broadcast era. PSM must think about how to include people in public affairs under new networked circumstances as the techno-social architecture of the public realm constantly changes.

### The place not to discuss controversial issues

Numerous studies have shown that social network media are not necessarily appropriate for such debates, despite the claimed democratic potential of social network media to engage people in conversation about matters of shared concern and public interest. This is particularly true for contentious topics. In contrast to offline settings like the family dinner table, the workplace, or an open community gathering, individuals are less likely to address contentious subjects on social media, according to a Pew Research Centre research conducted in America in 2014. According to the study's findings, "social media did not provide new forums for those who might otherwise remain silent to express their opinions and debate issues [3], [8].

Comparable research was done in Denmark in 2015 by the Danish Agency of Culture, which reached identical findings. In contrast to the 12 percent of Danes who would be "very willing" to do so in a public forum, just 6 percent of Danes would be "very willing" to discuss contentious matters on social media. Fully 25% of people would be "very willing" to talk about these topics at work, and 38% would do so during a family meal. According to a recent Norwegian research on citizens' readiness to debate the publishing of contentious religious cartoons, social media is not generally favoured by most people as a forum for such discussions.As a result, it would seem that the notion that social networking sites serve as a public forum for communication for a'silent majority' that is otherwise mute is unfounded.

The'spiral of silence' effect has been used to characterise people's reluctance to voice opposing viewpoints (Noelle-Neumann 1993). The less ready one is to address contentious matters, the more one expects others to disagree or feels uncertain about their ideas. People with minority viewpoints are more inclined to abstain from expressing a contrasting perspective, which makes social network media possibly more likely to support majority opinions in a discussion. The absence of alternative voices makes like-minded individuals feel their opinions are more broadly, generally shared than reality, which causes hesitation and a spiral of silence. The spiral of silence is a characteristic of all forms of communication and is not unique to social network sites. Additional explanatory elements are required if we

are to understand why individuals avoid debating contentious topics on social media. There are undoubtedly more, but I will only mention two here.

The aforementioned "context collapse" produces a hazy social setting that lessens the predictability of other participants' possible replies, including doubt about who one is truly chatting to in social network media. The platform and context of social network media may therefore push users to preserve face in the eyes of "friends" with a range of backgrounds and ties to the user, which might lead to a greater prevalence of the spiral of silence effect. Context collapse is more likely as a result of the algorithmic drive by Facebook and other social network media to expand the user's network. This often results in networks that are not only broader but also more diverse. The impact of this on political activity among even young politicians in Norway, who often utilise social networking sites to conduct political events, is supported by a research by Storsul (2014).

The findings suggests that they were hesitant to voice their political opinions on Facebook. Additionally, this environment's mixed social backdrop "causes teenagers to delimit controversies and try to keep political discussions to groups with more segregated audiences". As a result, the first aspect is that social networking sites have an equal chance of exacerbating the spiral of silence issue as they do of possibly fixing it. The second reason for the lack of interest in using social networking sites for public discussion of divisive subjects is the sometimes hostile atmosphere of online discourse, which includes "flaming" conduct and overt hate speech. This applies to online forums and social networking sites, as well as to online comments on news websites. People's desire to engage in discussions is predictably negatively impacted if they encounter hate speech online. Even if there isn't any explicit hate speech, the sometimes severe tone of online disputes may discourage individuals from participating in such forums.

The consequences for PSM are intricate. If PSM hosts online discussions on their own websites or via social networking sites like Facebook, they could be able to improve debate through the use of moderating. However, this presents difficulties for PSM agencies since they must adjust to the more lax standards of conversational etiquette in contrast to long-standing editing procedures in broadcasting. Additionally, they must contend with claims that they are restricting free expression, which is especially problematic for a media company that purports to provide "public service." The fact that the possibilities and difficulties are 'balanced' in a somewhat close manner shows how complicated the issue is, particularly for PSM.

It is necessary to contrast social network media's shortcomings with those of mainstream media in particular. The ability to join in public discussion is less open in the mainstream media, and many individuals refuse to do so even when requested to. They like to remain hidden from view. On the other hand, issues such whether equitable access permits the depiction of many points of view and the function of discussion moderators in ensuring the quality of debates are equally pertinent in traditional media and social network platforms. The internet and social network media per se, however, are touted as platforms that are intrinsically more democratic, inclusive, and likely to provide voice to those who might otherwise find it difficult to express their thoughts when compared to mainstream media. None of these assertions seem to be supported by the evidence, after reviewing it. This does not exclude the use of social network media for debate of matters of public concern, but this

does not result from the 'nature' of social network media. It can only come from the duties they are required to carry out in the interest of society. In the age of social network media, PSM has a significant role to play in this context, one that has historical and ongoing significance.

**Using social network media in the public's service**

two recent assessments done with Mattias Pape Rosenfeldt to demonstrate the potential advantage of public service responsibilities for the democratic performance of social network media. We looked at the discussions that the audience had after seeing two Danish television programmes regarding Islam, immigration, and cultural values. The discussions were held in both conventional media and on Facebook, and the shows were televised by the Danish public service broadcaster, DR. The controversy over the Mohammed cartoons in 2005 and 2006 showed how contentious conversations about Islam, immigration, and cultural values can be. This crisis was not an aberration, but rather a very heated event in a political discussion that dates back to the 1980s and is still relevant today, especially in light of the 2015 migration problems in Europe and the emergence of populist groups.

Numerous studies of how the media portrays immigration and Islam have shown that both are typically given a critical and even negative portrayal, especially when it comes to immigrants with Muslim backgrounds who are frequently linked to crime, terrorism, unemployment, and gender discrimination. Despite the fact that the news reports may be factually accurate, the overall trend shows that 'Muslim immigrants' are the focus of the media's attention. This might lead to a significant rift between the majority, "us," and the minority, "them," which could be harmful to integration attempts and potentially turn off immigration. They could be discouraged from taking part in open debates regarding topics pertaining to their own political and cultural existence in the host community. The revival of populist groups, who often blame Muslim immigration as the source of many social issues, has made this situation more urgent. In light of these divisive debates, we wanted to consider the possibility of not just discussing the problems but also genuinely attempting to solve them by reframing the argument and include immigrants in the conversation. In particular, we wanted to keep up with the discussion on Facebook and other platforms. We looked at the discussions that the public had about two very different kinds of television shows.

One of these was a comedy programme from 2013 called Still Veiled, which starred four women from ethnic minorities who parodied the biases and preconceptions held by both the mainstream population and Muslim minority populations. The other was a true film from 2015 called Rebellion from the Ghetto, which dealt with generational issues between young people of ethnic minorities and their parents around marriage, sexuality, homosexuality, etc. Both of these DR-commissioned and privately produced productions sparked discussions in traditional media (radio, newspapers, etc.) as well as social media.

The findings of our studies demonstrate that the discussions offered a broad range of framings of the many concerns and, to some extent, transcended the binary of "us versus them" that has been prevalent in mainstream news media. Additionally, individuals from ethnic minorities participated vigorously in the discussions in both the mainstream media and on social networking sites. They had a significant role when compared to the conventional ratio of representation for ethnic minority voices in news media coverage. By doing this, they exposed the range of opinions held by ethnic minorities in Denmark to the public. This was

the outcome of deliberate efforts made by DR and the commercial production businesses. They promoted a more varied discourse and made more voices feel welcome to join by purposefully downplaying certain framings and without pointing to a clear reason for issues. For instance, concerns were presented as cultural and generational challenges with which individuals might identify regardless of their religious inclinations rather than as religious ones.

Through a number of pre-screenings of the programme in certain social situations (such as schools with significant numbers of ethnic minority pupils), the documentary series, in particular, took deliberate steps to prepare the discussion. Opinion leaders from ethnic minorities were asked to see the series and provide feedback beforehand. When the series was later shown on public television, the early priming of important audiences offered a new starting point for the discussion. While there were plenty of heated arguments and heated words, the official Facebook sites for the TV show were professionally moderated to maintain a respectable degree of decorum. Additionally, a large number of participants from many ethnic groupings participated in the discussions, which increased engagement. A more diversified discussion would not have been guaranteed by debate planning and moderating alone, but thankfully, various other major media followed DR by providing room for more different views and assisting debates in moving towards the general objectives of the programming.

The two case studies show that social network media may provide a forum for public debate of important and difficult subjects in ways that foster arguments and include new individuals rather than encourage a cycle of silence, despite the shortcomings we have described. This assumes that PSM is aware of how to maximise the possibilities of social network media. Importantly, it also implies that this complements their established mass media professional repertoire. According to the research, PSM should see social media as a component of a larger, convergent media infrastructure, where PSM and other media work together to affect information flows and discussions that take place inside and across different media. Therefore, PSM could have a significant role to play beyond of their typical sphere a function that is especially pertinent in the setting of the networked society. Finally, it is important to note that the arguments we witnessed would not have likely occurred and developed as they did without the responsibilities and resources specific to PSM.

## CONCLUSION

In networks of social change, mediatization has a huge impact by enabling people and communities to mobilise, raise awareness, and promote transformational social action. This research looked at the idea of mediatization and how it affected several facets of societal development, offering insights into its dynamics, processes, and consequences.First, the way information is transmitted and distributed has been completely transformed by media platforms and communication technology. They have given people and social movements a strong tool to engage their followers, attract a wider audience, and magnify their voices. Particularly social media platforms have facilitated the quick dissemination of information and the development of groups and networks devoted to certain causes or social concern.

## REFERENCES:

[1] J. Strmbck, “Four phases of mediatization: An analysis of the mediatization of

politics", *Int. J. Press.*, 2008, doi: 10.1177/1940161208319097.

[2] M. A. Tudor, A. F. Benea, en S. Bratosin, "Covid-19 pandemic lockdown and religious mediatization of social sustainability. A case study of romania", *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 2021, doi: 10.3390/ijerph18052287.

[3] S. Bengtsson, K. Fast, A. Jansson, en J. Lindell, "Media and basic desires: An approach to measuring the mediatization of daily human life", *Communications*, 2021, doi: 10.1515/commun-2019-0122.

[4] B. Renser en K. Tiidenberg, "Witches on Facebook: Mediatization of Neo-Paganism", *Soc. Media Soc.*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/2056305120928514.

[5] M. Lövheim, "Mediatisation of religion: A critical appraisal", *Gos. Reli. Tserkov' v Ross. i za Rubezhom/State, Relig. Church Russ. Worldw.*, 2020, doi: 10.22394/2073-7203-2020-38-2-76-97.

[6] S. Z. Qudsy, I. Abdullah, en M. Pabbajah, "The Superficial Religious Understanding In Hadith Memes: Mediatization Of Hadith In The Industrial Revolution 4.0", *J. Study Relig. Ideol.*, 2021.

[7] K. Fast, "A discursive approach to mediatisation: Corporate technology discourse and the trope of media indispensability", *Media Commun.*, 2018, doi: 10.17645/mac.v6i2.1311.

[8] K. C. Robinson, "First Australians using mediatisation to preserve, maintain and promote cultural heritage", *Media Int. Aust.*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/1329878X19891574.

# CHAPTER 10
# DIGITAL MEDIA CULTURE AND PUBLIC SERVICE MEDIAIN THE PLATFORM ERA

Mathew Sinu Simon
Assistant Professor, Department of Law,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id:mathew.simon@presidencyuniversity.in

**ABSTRACT:**

the idea of mediatization and its function in social change networks. The term "mediatization" describes the ubiquitous impact of media on several facets of society, such as social movements, activism, and grassroots projects. This research looks at how media outlets and communication tools influence and support social change networks. This study intends to shed light on the transformational potential of media in nurturing social movements and advancing social change by analysing the processes, dynamics, and consequences of mediatization**.**

**KEYWORDS:**

Communication Technologies, Mediatization, Networks, Media Platforms, Social Movements.

## INTRODUCTION

Sociologists often emphasise the advantages of communication inside and between transnational groups when discussing the potential for the so-called network(ed) society.the introduction of VCR technology and the growth of cable TV heralded the demise of mass audiences and their replacement with "segmented, differentiated audiences" in terms of the simultaneity and uniformity of the messages they consume. In contrast to unidirectional mass media, Castells saw the emergence of empowered people utilising interactive media.Eli Noam (1995) also stressed the influence of "cyber-TV" with "me-channels" on individualization. Competition for frequencies, channels, and content is less important than fighting for customers' attention when media markets go through significant structural changes. Noam anticipated the swift entry of new companies in a disruptive environment and questioned if US productions would rule in developing international TV markets[1], [2].

He provided a response to his query only 10 years later, stating that "Internet TV will be strongly American" (Noam 2004: 242). In fact, this describes the worldwide internet video business, where Netflix and Amazon have established themselves as leaders and are already releasing localised in-house films.N Globalisation and individualization have therefore unquestionably come to pass. Noam also mentioned a third anticipation of fresh socialising outcomes. He thought that via cyber-TV and loosely defined "telecommunities," the shared mass audience television experience that previously forged a link might be replicated. The Usenet's early experience in cyberspace made it reasonable to assume that peer-to-peer interactions would expand. He could not have predicted the rise of peer-to-peer middleman platforms or the concept of sharing as a commodity. Content remains crucial, without a doubt, but the middleman who equalises all content may be said to be king[3], [4].

The rise of digital infrastructures in broadcast media has been the key point of contention in talks about the future of PSM for more than twenty years. Digital technology is relatively new, but broadcasting is not. An intricate web of interconnected systems for production, storage, and dissemination adaptation have been the emphasis, with important ramifications for workflows and jobs. But if broadcasting as a whole loses importance, this emphasis becomes less and less helpful.

Unfortunately, media regulation lags behind the growing technological and business revolution, leaving PSM with particular concerns about their place in future national and international media systems. In all Western cultures, younger generations (those under the age of 45) are progressively turning away from linear media, which is significant given how viewers act differently nowadays. Even older generations are using smartphones as mobile media devices, demonstrating the depth and breadth of the disruption. Along with this risk comes the possibility that PSM may lose political and public support[5], [6].

They are likely to lose their historical significance in daily life unless they are able to play a similar substantial role in online domains as they have in conventional media systems. Although they are not utilised as often or frequently as they once were, they are still trusted. The internet and its intermediate platforms provide a wide range of subjects and points of view, but they do so with the emphasis on public service and social responsibility that the conventional press and broadcasters favoured. This should be reason for alarm. The previously ideal public realm is becoming divided into multiple communication spaces without a shared or common aim. Not only is the media being disrupted, but also the fundamental Western social institutions of friendship, participation, sharing, openness, and discourse. Under the circumstances of modern digital communication, digital economics, and digital cultures, all of this has to be redefined. It is necessary to discuss how far the media disruption process has progressed, how it will effect PSM now and in the future, and with what ramifications. Re-visionary interpretations of the public enterprise in media are what RIPE is all about, and they are definitely needed today.

Understanding the dire position of PSM is made easier with a little consideration on a few important statistics. Content does not get as much attention online as it does in the broadcast environment. Additionally, it's not the only issue. Attention varies in quality and effects, which is one of the early discoveries in media study (for an example, read Cantrill 1947). Due to multitasking, linear media consumption in daily life is often marked by poor attention spans. Because non-linear material requires ongoing interactive involvement (searching, scrolling, clicking, like, connecting, etc.), it is likely that non-linear content reception attracts more attention.

In actuality, media usage context has always been crucial. As Walter Lippmann (1922) noted early on, the 'news value' of information was never the only factor that dictated its relevance for the general audience. In addition, personal communication tends to have the greatest overall influence, which further emphasises the importance of each news consumer's communication networks in assessing relevance, which is often the result of the total of all results from all channels visited. The appraisal of information relevance may now be greatly influenced by social media platforms that depend on this, such as Twitter PSM's usefulness for opinion formation is in jeopardy because of how closely they are tied to the PSB's ongoing emphasis on linear material delivery. The distribution of the major news sources

throughout generations. The findings show that the majority of mass media users are above the age of 45. Year after year, the statistical midpoint increases[7], [8].

## DISCUSSION

### Media platforms

In the years leading up to the dotcom crash, between 1995 and 2000, broadcast media used the internet. Instead of the creation of internet services for personal computers, broadcasters were more interested in the potential for interactive TV. Enterprises took different initial steps into online ecosystems. others only provided promotional materials for certain programmes, others tried streaming brief segments of broadcast programming, and some started experimenting with content and communications unique to the internet, such live chat. All of these initiatives eventually focused on the growth of networked media in PSM, which was seen as a "third pillar" in addition to radio and television. It was commonly accepted that the internet and the broadcasting pillars were somehow related, but this was often considered as a separate category.

After the early years, there was varying degrees of support for publicly funded digital services, but EU governance remained typically steadfast. While some broadcasting enterprises, both public and private, such as the BBC in Britain and Yle in Finland, saw the importance of this, in many instances their leaders lacked the long-term vision to see the benefits of investing heavily in these'side' operations. The window of opportunity closed when press publishers launched an offensive in response to the sharp decrease in ad turnover, particularly in Germany and the UK, which have bigger media markets. The state-aid compromise of 2005–2007 is largely explained by the PSM interpretation of unlawful market distortion.

In Germany specifically, public broadcasters' online material is increasingly being limited to services connected to their programming, and what is provided online must be distinct from what is provided by the press and its digital offshoots. The fight for PSM mostly took place inside national borders at the same time as these companies experienced a thorough transformation that prioritised digital networks. The concept of "networked societies" suggests a positive outlook that underlines people' presumptive autonomy and sovereignty. But this picture is undermined by two crucial factors that have received little attention in the discourse:

1. Although the digital economy is founded on technological networks, "networked societies" are not always created by these networks. Although necessary for promoting digital goods and services, the technological network often doesn't provide any unique qualities. For instance, Amazon diversified the selection of products by first selling books and then allowing other vendors to use the site in exchange for a fee. But the goods were neither novel nor distinctive. The growth of data storage and analysis capabilities coupled with worldwide cloud services is novel and crucial. As of right now, Amazon is a sizable cloud computing platform with a virtual department store, a streaming service, and a unique worldwide production method.
2. Any separation between "frontend and backend" aspects i.e., what is visible to and interactable by users was also absent. The core of the business and the one in charge of each platform's functionality is all that is not.

Amazon, Facebook, and Google all have significant data assessment systems at their core. Their ability to analyse large amounts of data and their in-house developed artificial intelligence-based algorithms are their key competitive advantages. The recorded music sector provides a crucial illustration. The internet created new avenues for music sharing, and streaming services like Spotify, which once focused on selling physical goods and failed to develop other revenue models, have now come to be seen as essential for the music industry. The market is now controlled by new intermediate platforms, and streaming services are starting to create original music. Internet streaming providers increasingly offer their own material in addition to distributing that of others. In addition, they provide communication, personalization, and feedback services as experts in all internet-based technologies. They pay close attention to user behaviour and respond fast and flexibly. When taken as a whole, this denotes a change from content aggregators to platforms that provide application programming interfaces (API) and distinctive services for customers, partners, and users. About 10 years ago, the transition started.

A excellent example is Google News. It was once thought of as an alternative for single sources, but in recent years, it started working with publishers to share money. Facebook began as a social networking site but has now evolved into a revenue-sharing platform. Large publishers bemoan this "digital duopoly" that regulates online news flow and access to advertising income, yet they are nevertheless reliant on it. This change suggests that the intermediate function is now king instead of content. Platforms just care about attracting people; they are not concerned with the details of the material. For them, lock-in is the most important factor. For the platform operator, it is ideal if all of the trending information is available on a single website and leaving is not an option.

**Media platforms and public service media**

PSM is impacted by the platform economy in a number of ways. Globally speaking, the major intermediate platforms. For instance, Amazon Prime Video has overtaken Netflix as the market leader in Germany, leaving Maxdome, the only other German streaming video provider, with only 10% of the market. The regional content and reputable local journalism may be appealing to the national PSM provider, but in all other respects, their structure and design look archaic and are not particularly competitive. Although the BBC's iPlayer successfully competes in this market and other PSM companies also perform well (such as Yle's Arena service), dependability is limited since programming disappears from day to day owing to broadcast rules and copyright limitations. The majority of the time, the legally permitted access duration is quite little, particularly for bought material. Many works are unavailable online or in media repositories. Users post some illegally copied material to YouTube, but the longevity of this content is also questionable. In many nations, PSM isn't even permitted when working with business partners.

Legal restrictions, unfavourable organisational structures, a lack of financial resources, and sometimes just plain reluctance on the part of the leadership therefore work together to impede the development of digital transformation and ultimately prevent the maturation of PSM. In certain instances, politicians have compelled the construction of cutting-edge digital services because they are more visionary than PSM leadership. This may be seen, for instance, in Germany with the launch of the streaming site "Funk," which caters to younger audiences. Instead of appreciating the legal innovation that enabled them to generate and

licence online material separately from broadcast shows, the public broadcasters asked for a new TV channel.

The sole distinguishing feature (USP) of PSM broadcasts available online, including live streaming and on-demand content, is its presumptive quality. However, unlike the much-discussed early years, online rivalry is not about content characteristics or even users' engaged attention for particular material. Contrary to Terranova (2012) and Wu (2016), regulating customer behaviour is not even the primary aim. Simply said, the goal of competition is to have as many participants as possible on a given platform. The platform operator doesn't really notice if someone is paying attention or not. However, five hours spent watching Netflix material indicates that no other services, channels, or media were used for that five hours. Platforms that act as a middleman between content or service suppliers and end consumers are unaffected by either attention or content. The competition on the web today, in the era of platforms, is not about quality content or engaged attention, but rather about time spent and exploitable user data.

Lock-in demands platforms that are appealing, versatile, and simple to use. The fundamental business model for the commercial side is revenue sharing.Because platforms eat up media consumption time, this also has an impact on PSM. Outside of broadcasting, PSM often provides a wide range of material but does not control or operate the platform. Legal, organisational, and financial restrictions may even make it impossible to take proactive measures to develop in digital media contexts. This is shown by the prior example of online archives and catch-up service limitations. PSM has been working towards digitising archives for 20 years, but there is still more to be done.In reality, it often entails throwing away a large portion of historical material.

the legal framework for broadcast archives is convoluted. Before the advent of internet dissemination, any work was subject to the written consent of the copyright holders for each individual piece. Contracts with rights holders for material created in the platform age must include provisions that permit or at the very least do not prohibit a public offering in online repositories. That often involves additional charges when agreed. Additionally, PSM groups sometimes do not have the rights to all of the modern stuff they provide. Most individuals expect that all broadcast material will also be accessible online if they have paid fees or taxes for their services. Few are aware of the limitations. Only a portion of the 300 new radio plays that PSM creates in Germany each year are available in internet libraries. Co-producers, usually via streaming partners, instead sell the rights to other businesses. Unless they happen to be listening to the linear broadcast, interested listeners seldom have the opportunity to acquire "free" access to radio plays. Such artistic creations and facets of cultural heritage need to be available without such restrictions, but a complete buy-out of rights would be necessary first.

Reusing content for new productions is a fundamental goal for public broadcasters with digitalized archives, and this drives corporate policies for the preservation of historical materials and associated information. The latter is intended for broadcast editors and writers rather than researchers who often have trouble locating certain information in the archives. Public broadcasters are not required by law to even run archives in Germany. Any moment may be the end of them. However, the audiovisual legacy represented by these archives is significant. Access to archive material is crucial for scholars in the humanities, media studies,

and political science. How archive metadata might be improved through collaborative tagging on open platforms is a serious issue that is explored in worldwide committees of librarians and archivists Broadcast archives may become more accessible via open metadata and automated recognition and indexing systems, but this requires legal, political, and economical considerations. Together with other cultural organisations that get public funding, this should also be done. In the context of the digital media culture, open archives are a vital public service.

## CONCLUSION

In networks of social change, mediatization has a huge impact by enabling people and communities to mobilise, raise awareness, and promote transformational social action. This research looked at the idea of mediatization and how it affected several facets of societal development, offering insights into its dynamics, processes, and consequences.First, the way information is transmitted and distributed has been completely transformed by media platforms and communication technology. They have given people and social movements a strong tool to engage their followers, attract a wider audience, and magnify their voices. Particularly social media platforms have facilitated the quick dissemination of information and the development of groups and networks devoted to certain causes or social concerns.

**REFERENCES:**

[1] D. V. Dunas en S. A. Vartanov, “Emerging digital media culture in Russia: modeling the media consumption of Generation Z”, *J. Multicult. Discourses*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/17447143.2020.1751648.

[2] C. Bareither, “Difficult heritage and digital media: ‘selfie culture’ and emotional practices at the Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe”, *Int. J. Herit. Stud.*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/13527258.2020.1768578.

[3] E. Ng, “No Grand Pronouncements Here..: Reflections on Cancel Culture and Digital Media Participation”, *Telev. New Media*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/1527476420918828.

[4] H. Ju, “Premediating a narrative of growth: Bts, digital media, and fan culture”, *Pop. Entertain. Stud.*, 2019.

[5] T. Rikakis, A. Kelliher, en N. Lehrer, “Experiential media and digital culture”, *Computer (Long. Beach. Calif).*, 2013, doi: 10.1109/MC.2012.391.

[6] J. Potter en J. McDougall, *Digital Media, Culture and Education: Theorising Third Space Literacies*. 2017. doi: 10.1057/978-1-137-55315-7.

[7] F. Suwana en Lily, “Empowering Indonesian women through building digital media literacy”, *Kasetsart J. Soc. Sci.*, 2017, doi: 10.1016/j.kjss.2016.10.004.

[8] P. L. Liu, “COVID-19 Information Seeking on Digital Media and Preventive Behaviors: The Mediation Role of Worry”, *Cyberpsychology, Behav. Soc. Netw.*, 2020, doi: 10.1089/cyber.2020.0250.

# DETERMINATION OF DIGITAL MEDIA CULTURE

Ummul Waraah
Assistant Professor, Department of Law,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id:ummulwaraah@presidencyuniversity.in

**ABSTRACT:**

Digital technology's broad acceptance has given rise to the complex and ever-evolving phenomena known as "digital media culture." The way we communicate, exchange information, and take part in online communities is shaped by the many facets of online communication, content production, and consumption. This summary gives a succinct outline of the culture of digital media while emphasising its essential components and ramifications. . Screen resolution and electronic programme guides have successfully undergone technological modernization, while the latter has not taken the position of TV magazines and newspapers as the primary source of programme information. Personal video recording (PVR) might theoretically be replaced by online audio-visual archives.

**KEYWORDS:**

Communication, Content creation, Consumption, Digital media, Online communities, Online culture.

## INTRODUCTION

The process of digital transformation has only just begun with the digitalisation of manufacturing, storage and delivery. Although organisational structures and technological infrastructures have altered, the transition to mature PSM has only just started. Distribution methods are simply one aspect of maturity; other aspects include content, presentation, tone, external (legal), internal regulations, and, most importantly, the institution's soul. Digital advancements have made some gains for audiences, but nothing really essential. Screen resolution and electronic programme guides have successfully undergone technological modernization, while the latter has not taken the position of TV magazines and newspapers as the primary source of programme information. Personal video recording (PVR) might theoretically be replaced by online audio-visual archives, however this is dependent on the factors mentioned above[1], [2].

Broadcasting corporations, who are really online performers first and foremost, do not yet see themselves as "pure players," to put it more simply. Their primary objective is to distribute material linearly. An annexe to it is online communication. Of course, PSM is not the only example of this. The same may be said for commercial broadcasting organisations.One wouldn't be able to legitimately claim that the digital transition is complete until this disposition is, in a sense, reversed and linear distribution is made the particular case. However, at the moment, PSM supporters primarily lack this strategic focus. To be honest, compared to most other PSM organisations, this is less of an issue at the BBC and Yle. In such instances, several levels of post-broadcasting period development have been described.

Analysis of past initiatives to promote acceptability in the digital environment shows that only a comprehensive reform of all procedures and regulations can provide the desired

outcomes. In 2005 and 2011, The New York Times made two failed efforts. This served as the foundation for the New York Times' third attemptwhich seems to have been successful—to optimise every procedure across the whole company for digital operations rather than print. If this rule were to apply to PSM, it would imply that, if any idea at all, it would not be mainly focused on providing linear shows. Furthermore, discovering the true demands of internet and mobile consumers requires engaging with them directly.The "convergence" idea may make it difficult to understand how media evolution is now progressing since it implies that after an ambiguous but seemingly protracted time of coexistence, the identity of "old" media will (slowly) blend with components of "new" media[3], [4].

It is now largely accepted as common knowledge that new media won't displace existing media. However, all media companies must contend with the developmental dynamics of the digital media environment, a fact that has often been grossly underestimated and discounted.According to Jenkins (2006), the experience between 2000 and 2005 led to an unwarranted confidence about media consumers' ability to participate actively in society following the conversion of broadcast and online media. It seems that viewers' active participation has mainly been restricted to providing profile information for digital platform intermediaries' algorithmic analysis.

However, in the platform age of the digital media culture, broadcasting and online media do not belong in the same category. As has been noted, the experimental beginnings of online PSM are seen as the "third pillar." Online media are not just another channel in the marketplace; they have the ability to bring all other media channels together into one cohesive system. The process is, at the very least, shifting the position of the media and redefining (downward) its importance. Today's PSM process presents a challenge.

PSM as a whole is still awaiting a paradigm shift. The concept of a "networked society" is oversimplified by the digital media culture, which offers more room for evaluating old media institutions and lets a far wider range of participants decide how to relate media to society in the platform age. Additionally, it demands the ongoing adaptability of all media companies. The DMC raises new issues for the assessment and categorization of services and content by erasing conventional divisions between media and between professionals and active consumers. Disorientation is not a problem since many people are changing their own "signal-to-noise-ratio." Surveys, on the other hand, reveal that consumers who appreciate their new sovereignty are satisfied (see Shearer & Gottfried 2017). Legacy media companies, both public and commercial, are most affected by this shift[5], [6].

PSM in particular is becoming more and more involved in intermedia conflicts with print publishers that assert the right to solely construct their online services using all accessible digital assets, including text, photographs, videos, etc. They contend that PSM should be limited to broadcasting and even then, to material that raises questions about market failure (i.e., that which is not in demand). For instance, in Switzerland, text components are limited to 1000 characters unless they are closely connected to broadcast programming; only 25% of texts without these ties are permitted (BAKOM 2007). Newspaper publishers are fighting against a regulation in Germany called "press resemblance," which states that the medium, style, and content of websites and applications from PSM cannot resemble those of printed newspapers.

The transition to a mature PSM is hampered by two interrelated paradigms. One is the preference for linear production and distribution versus non-linear tactics, which is done for a number of different reasons. The broadcasting orientation is supported by commissioning laws, technological frameworks, staff credentials, and senior citizens' widespread usage of broadcasting. Political groups and business stakeholders that worry about economic upheaval also mostly support this. Additionally, prevailing media consumption trends suggest that the broadcast age will continue for a number of more decades. However, there is also a risk of PSM losing its validity overnight, especially in Germany, a significant European media market. There is no mandate for changing the media system as a whole, and political and popular support is fading. In October 2017, a CDU official advocated limiting ARD's authority to only broadcast regional programming and ending Tagesschau, the news show that served as the organization's journalistic pinnacle. What will happen is still uncertain as of this writing.

## DISCUSSION

### Algorithms and Public Service Media

media serving the public (PSM). A collection of sometimes opaque guidelines for choosing and suggesting media material is known as an algorithm. A key component of platforms for networked communication is algorithmic media. Concerning PSM implications is where our interest is. We start by providing a general introduction of computer ethics since normative concerns are the fundamental problems. We emphasise the significance and difficulties of editorial work in the context of the networked world. We contend that although algorithms cannot eliminate issues brought on by editorial prejudice, they may be useful when combined with human judgement. The chapter is crucial for thinking through the creation of PSM policies since algorithmic media are becoming more prevalent and may even be essential to the media networks that support a networked society as a whole.The business models of Facebook, Google, Netflix, and Amazon rely on the ongoing creation of proprietary algorithms that automate the presentation of content selection options to each user as a customised set of recommendations based on assumed or actual interest, as indicated by prior online activity using a platform.A logic component, which specifies the knowledge to be used in solving problems, and a control component, which determines the problem-solving strategies by means of that knowledge" are the two parts of an algorithm, according to Kowalski (1979: 424).

The emergence of algorithms in PSM is consistent with this broader pattern in networked media, but it also creates challenging ethical issues since it results in a change in agency from that of person decision-making to that of automated systems. This change enables redefining the traditional notion of "audiences" as "users," which in theory represents the de-prioritization of consumption in general. Self-driving cars, which transfer decision-making authority from the driver to sophisticated software, are a common example used in the area of computer ethics. The "black box" of an on-board computer that uses algorithms to make driving "decisions" conceals both causation and outcome. The crucial issue in this situation is whether the software or the driver, who in this case isn't really a driver, is to blame for what occurs during vehicle operation and what doesn't. or perhaps the software's programmer or coder? Or maybe the person in charge of the network grid that permits systemic communication as the car travels through the road environment[6]–[9].

Because automated systems might make "decisions" that are based on false normative or behavioural assumptions, the example's practical issue is an uneven allocation of agency. In the worst case scenario, there is no way to overturn the automatic judgement. Because of this, algorithmic suggestions are delicate subjects that need to be discussed with people. However, as the outputs of recommendation systems are generated by a series of intricate computations that are sometimes counterintuitive, describing and comprehending them needs a comprehensive understanding of technical concepts. Additionally, suggestions are often the outcome of many algorithms being used to evaluate consumer behaviour data both online and offline Netflix is a popular example. Due to its public nature and commitments to uphold social responsibility, PSM is particularly troubled by the unequal relationship that this fosters between users and media content producers. Therefore, it serves as the main topic of debate.

Danaher (2016) has highlighted a second problem of special importance to the public perception of PSM as a danger he termed as "algocracy" that is anchored in the secrecy of algorithmic decision-making. This is relevant to network media companies' ownership and commercial use of a constantly growing number of personal data that is gathered and combined as "big data" for their strategic and business objectives. A substantial body of work addressing privacy issues associated with this danger has grown over the last 20 years. Danaher underlines how inaccessible algorithms are because they use complicated parameters and processing, which most people find difficult to understand. A third, more particular concern materialises when algorithms are utilised by PSM groups, in addition to generic issues with opacity and privacy infringement. Lack of transparency and intrinsic system complexity might endanger PSM credibility, thus public sector entities using automated systems should take these factors seriously.

Because they provide tailored suggestions as a consequence of complex calculations based on stated personal preferences, algorithms may be highly helpful. It is somewhat understood how this works and partially hidden. Although Google, Facebook, Amazon, and Netflix use general filtering principles that have been published, the configuration, implementation, and datasets are private. Personalised systems, according to Sunstein (2007), are beneficial for maximising media exposure but might skew a person's exposure to sources and encourage "filter bubbles". This issue has been validated by research. Researchers have also shown that, even when utilising the same information, Google, Facebook, and Twitter utilise distinct filtering techniques that result in varying ranks. In other words, algorithms are essential for choosing what data and sources are located, how fast and readily, and with what priority. In a networked society, the nature and quality of public life are of utmost importance. However, we do not infer that recommendations in and of themselves are novel. To do this, broadcasting has traditionally employed scheduling techniques, previews or trailers, and promotion.

However, the display of content selection choices in broadcasting is less specifically tailored to people based on a personal history of conduct and is more open albeit not entirely. The rising amount of specific data that is now held and can only be studied by the company that owns the platform and utilises this information only to further its own self-interested goals has not been created by the conventional broadcast manner of content delivery. In the context of networked media, inaccurate assumptions about user preferences often highlight issues with algorithmic systems. A well-known instance is the'straight' TiVo user who got suggestions for gay-related films. He purposefully watched films about war in an effort to

rectify the misconceptions, but he soon started getting suggestions for films about the Third Reich and the Nazis.

As a result, even while they may be helpful or even advantageous in certain circumstances, recommendations' quality depends on how well the algorithm was designed, which is always predicated on a set of assumptions that may turn out to be false in practise. So to speak, this is personalization gone wrong.

Recommendations are based on how the programme has been designed to mimic user demands. Based on mathematical formulae, collaborative filtering is a key component of algorithms Accuracy is clearly crucial, but it may be difficult to attain and isn't sufficient by itself to provide a positive user experience The ultimate objective is serendipity, which occurs when a user feels that the system "read my mind" In order to do this, it is necessary to estimate user preferences in order to suggest material that strikes a difficult balance between predictability and originality. The majority of algorithms are commercial solutions that integrate a variety of techniques to weight findings based on complex and often concealed data analysis.

PSM organisations are becoming more and more engaged with algorithms in two different ways. The first is that their material is subject to the same dynamics of the recommendation system as all other types of information that may be searched for online. No content creation firm can escape this, thus it must be handled as effectively as possible using metadata and search engine optimisation approaches. In order to increase interactive services and personalization, as well as the discoverability and visibility of their material, a growing number of PSM businesses are creating their own algorithmic recommender systems.

**ABC ChatBot**

By co-creating technology with their "audience," and generating tales utilising third-party platforms (particularly Facebook), the Australian Broadcasting Corporation has created an automated service that depends on an algorithmic design that aims to circumvent the "black box" software issue. The ABC ChatBot, with its unique ethos that prioritises openness, is our case study for operationalizing concerns that are crucial to the creation of algorithms in PSM.A user may get news updates from ABC Chatbot immediately on their phone using a notification system that runs on the Facebook Messenger platform. The items often consist of a combination of three articles: one on a major piece of news, one about a less urgent but still significant societal issue, and one about lifestyle. The user communicates with the chatbot using brief messages that trigger automatic answers. The initiative illustrates the importance of automation and suggestion in the growth of journalism and news in PSM, which have long been a key component of their public services.

## CONCLUSION

The way we interact with media and one another has been completely transformed by digital media culture. Social media platforms have developed as a result, making it easier to communicate, share material, and create online communities. Additionally, it has democratised the process of producing material by enabling users to create and distribute their own media. However, the culture of digital media also brings with it problems like information overload, privacy issues, and the propagation of false information. It's crucial for people to navigate this environment critically and ethically as digital media landscape

continues to grow. For one to engage in the digital world successfully and morally, one must acquire media literacy skills and comprehend the ramifications of digital media culture.

**REFERENCES:**

[1] J. Reyna, J. Hanham, en P. Meier, "A taxonomy of digital media types for Learner-Generated Digital Media assignments", *E-Learning Digit. Media*, 2017, doi: 10.1177/2042753017752973.

[2] J. Reyna, J. Hanham, en P. Meier, "The Internet explosion, digital media principles and implications to communicate effectively in the digital space", *E-Learning Digit. Media*, 2018, doi: 10.1177/2042753018754361.

[3] R. K. Singh, B. P. Kushwaha, T. Chadha, en V. A. Singh, "Influence Of Digital Media Marketing And Celebrity Endorsement On Consumer Purchase Intention", *J. Content, Community Commun.*, 2021, doi: 10.31620/JCCC.12.21/12.

[4] M. Madra-Sawicka, J. H. Nord, J. Paliszkiewicz, en T. R. Lee, "Digital media: Empowerment and equality", *Inf.*, 2020, doi: 10.3390/INFO11040225.

[5] S. Boulianne en Y. Theocharis, "Young People, Digital Media, and Engagement: A Meta-Analysis of Research", *Soc. Sci. Comput. Rev.*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/0894439318814190.

[6] R. Tsuria, "Digital media: When god becomes everybody—the blurring of sacred and profane", *Religions*, 2021, doi: 10.3390/rel12020110.

[7] F. L. Scott, "Family mediation of preschool children's digital media practices at home", *Learn. Media Technol.*, 2022, doi: 10.1080/17439884.2021.1960859.

[8] J. Reyna en P. Meier, "Co-creation of knowledge using mobile technologies and digital media as pedagogical devices in undergraduate STEM education", *Res. Learn. Technol.*, 2020, doi: 10.25304/rlt.v28.2356.

[9] P. L. Liu, "COVID-19 Information Seeking on Digital Media and Preventive Behaviors: The Mediation Role of Worry", *Cyberpsychology, Behav. Soc. Netw.*, 2020, doi: 10.1089/cyber.2020.0250.

# CHAPTER 11
# A BRIEF STUDY ON EBU MEMBERS RECOMMENDER SYSTEMS

Aprajita Verma
Assistant Professor, Department of Law,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id:aprajita.verma@presidencyuniversity.in

**ABSTRACT:**

Members of the EBU (European Broadcasting Union) employ recommender systems. Media platforms utilise recommender systems, which are algorithms, to provide consumers personalised suggestions based on their tastes and behaviours. With an emphasis on their function in audience engagement, content discovery, and the difficulties connected with their usage, this research investigates the acceptance, deployment, and effect of recommender systems among EBU members. This research attempts to shed light on the practises and consequences of recommender systems inside the EBU network by analysing these dynamics.

**KEYWORDS:**

Audience Engagement, Content Discovery, EBU Members, Personalized Recommendations, Recommender Systems.

## INTRODUCTION

Algorithmic suggestions are a common feature of interactive services, but until recently, public service media websites almost ever used them. However, conferences for its Big Data Initiative have shown an increasing level of interest among EBU members.On the basis of assessing sizable volumes of media consumption data gathered through PSM online services, these seminars investigate the possibilities for PSM content marketing and production planning. By using algorithmic recommendation systems to reach consumers more effectively, editors may be able to more carefully monitor and immediately spot changing patterns in user interests in real time. PSM project leaders, data analysts, programmers, and managers from the BBC (UK), ERR (Estonia), RAI, (Italy), RTÉ (Ireland), RTS (Switzerland), and YLE (Finland) have also discussed the challenges in a series of interviews with big data practitioners from DR (Denmark), ZDF (Germany), RTBF (Belgium), and BR (Germany[1], [2].

The respondents saw the use of 'big data' algorithmic suggestions as strategically crucial for the survival of PSM companies in an increasingly networked media environment. When it comes to exposing PSM content in comparison to other content providers, failing to assess user behaviours and give customised suggestions would compromise essential information about user preferences. The algorithmic recommendation system is seen to be essential for displaying PSM material on modern media platforms.A worry exists. As was already said, feeding filter bubbles is a major editorial problem. Many people are concerned that an algorithm that optimises suggestions based on particular and presumed user preferences may contradict general PSM programming policy, which is based on legal requirements as well as ethical considerations, since PSM is required to deliver impartial and fair programming. This is a pressing issue as PSM firms struggle with the practical issues related to conducting large data analyses and creating recommender systems, which are challenging and need for specialised technical abilities in software development. Simply developing and maintaining a

PSM organisation on its own may be an onerous undertaking. Although this strategy would increase organisational knowledge and provide complete control over the user data obtained, implementing it would be expensive and time-consuming[3], [4]. Some PSM enterprises, like those in Denmark, choose to pursue a quick launch. it's essential to stay up with the other providers' quick development of crucial media platforms. Other PSM companies do not see an urgent need for recommender systems and instead choose a longer time horizon for their implementation. A third group, which includes the BBC (UK), NRK (Norway), RAIplay (Italy), RPT (Portugal), YLE (Finland), and ZDF (Germany), already has recommender systems.

The speed of technical advancement is quick, and much of the information offered by PSM is comparable to that of commercial media. Consequently, using a "off the shelf" commercial recommender system is one alternative. Control issues play a role in the decision of whether to utilise a pre-built recommender service or create one on their own. A strategic vulnerability might be created by the usage of external software. According to one interviewee, managing user data and recommendation system software may soon be just as crucial as it was before for many PSM operators to manage radio transmitters. Future study on recommender systems should pay close attention to whether the installation of these systems truly results in a loss of autonomy, independence, or integrity for these organisations.

For PSM organisations, selecting a technology solution presents important issues. A group of PSM organisations within the EBU have collaborated to create the "PEACH" project, a PSM-focused recommender system that combines traditional recommender algorithms content-based filtering to find similar content and collaborative filtering to find similar users with a cutting-edge mechanism to recommend a variety of content. This might be seen as a first effort to include editorial values particular to PSM in an algorithm, as stated query concerning end-user involvement to guarantee fair exposure and equitable opportunities for media content exposure is yet unanswered at the operational/technical level. The dilemma is whether PSM's unique requirements to provide impartial programming need the creation of a novel algorithmic recommendation solution or whether current suggestion principles developed from e-commerce and online shopping practise are enough.

Algorithm adoption suggests a change inside PSM organisations. The automated, rule-based publication of information on websites and applications puts conventional editing practise to the test. Additionally, big data platforms that provide commercial media businesses with real-time analytics, accurate user segmentation, and behaviour prediction pose a threat to the conventional measurement of broadcasting reach. The insights that may be gained from in-depth studies of PSM customer behaviour will put traditional methods of planning and assessing programme and service effectiveness to the test. Reliance on algorithms will put into question the traditional Reithian principle of not only providing people what they want but also exposing them to new stuff. Again, owing to the necessity of uniqueness for PSM material, PSM firms must take a different approach to the interpretation of what counts to consumer data.

Additionally, the new technologies need a challenging knowledge transfer inside PSM businesses. Now, activities that are important predictors of exposure to PSM material are carried out by data analysts and computer programmers (developers). Success now involves more than just creating and implementing plans. Since they often refrain from participating in

these development efforts, journalists and editors find it challenging to understand this information. This may strategically undermine the organisation and, on a more practical level, lead to issues from neglecting to incorporate or properly label the information that is crucial for findability. A tiny set of specialists have a deep knowledge of how a system promotes information, which brings us back to the issue of "opaqueness" noted by Danaher (2016). In the end, this emphasises the need of redefining PSM editorial work in the future as a public data curation service[5]–[7].

## DISCUSSION

### Reach and Distinctiveness

The struggle to preserve individuality while expanding reach is a recurring issue in PSM. Does automated suggestion put this equilibrium in jeopardy? Discussion of this tension will probably resurface as PSM groups deploy algorithms. The goal of suggesting is to increase the audience that PSM material might potentially reach, however using algorithms necessitates standardising the nature of the content and could muddy the differences that are necessary for PSM content to be distinctive. Whether conventional notions of reach and uniqueness can be consistent across broadcast and internet material delivery is a related subject. Furthermore, will broadcasting serve the needs of society as a whole or the preferences of each individual consumer? If the latter occurs, which appears increasingly plausible as broadcast spectrum is challenged and networked media platforms expand, this might jeopardise the legacy focus on communal social service for the public Commercial recommendation systems are created to meet specific consumer demands as shown by use trends. The uniqueness of PSM material is not yet taken into account as a parameter by algorithms. The same recommender concepts that are often used in commercial media may also lead to allegations of market failure and expensive and time-consuming "public value tests" (PVTs).

### Provision of diversity

Organisations in the SM sector have a special responsibility to reflect and advance diversity. This has often been covered in production and programming. Diversity protection becomes more challenging when internet intermediaries like Facebook and Google increasingly control access to users' attention. The editorial awareness of diversity that is essential to PSM as such is currently not reflected by any automated method Editors may guarantee various viewpoints and material for viewers in the context of broadcasting, but this is not the case for online media, since recommendation systems pattern the display of possibilities according on algorithms. To map the distinctions between diversity that is created manually during the development and programming of material vs diversity that is mathematically computed (automated), further study will be required.

### Transparency

Paternalistic attitudes have been attributed to PSB groups Paternalism may be seen as the 'gate-keeping' role in which material is chosen and controlled for knowledge transmission. Algorithmic recommender systems run the danger of reinforcing views that PSM is paternalistic. According to Tintarev and Masthoff (2015), it is crucial to explain to consumers why and how certain information is suggested, even if this is a challenging undertaking given the technological complexity. PSM management and auditing is another component of

algorithmic suggestion transparency. User login requirements coupled with digital material distribution provide chances for in-depth data on consumption trends. Will PSM organisations' performance objectives and key performance indicators be tied to specific user groups or demographics? Will they be connected to specific policy objectives. As a result, PSM's "universalist mission" would be seriously jeopardized [3], [4].

**User sovereignty and the attention economy**

The worry that consumers are overwhelmed by information is a well-known justification for creating recommendation systems. Actually, the goal is to maximise exposure to a certain piece of material. Although recommendation systems may aid users in controlling their attention & focus, these systems are unable to address certain conflicts of interest. Some PSM programming regulations may be enforced with the use of algorithms such as airing a minimum amount of national music, but this just serves to exacerbate the ongoing conflict between agenda-setting and user agency, or between paternalism and popularity. The already addressed reach-distinctiveness issue now has a techno-paternalistic component.

**Dependency**

Public service broadcasting prioritises editorial freedom However, today's media content exposure and dissemination depend more and more on social network middlemen that make use of recommendation algorithms. For PSM organizations which are not-for-profit but are ingrained actors in a commercial media ecology this poses a conundrum. As Srensen and van den Bulck (forthcoming) show, PSM organisations are becoming more dependent on and integrated into the global business ecology of web services as a result of using external third-party web services for media content delivery, media recommendation, audience behaviour measurement, and the sale of advertising. Although this makes sense operationally, it might undermine the credibility of PSM companies by giving the impression that they are unduly focused on optimising their chances of success in the marketplace. This raises concerns about how PSM organisations are relying more and more on commercial software suppliers with proprietary interests, outside providers that are not required to provide public services in the traditional sense, and social networks that are under their control. Dependence need not always be a negative thing.

**Policy, Structures and Governance**

improvements and discussions. We compared PSM adaptations in Western nations to the "digital age," which is kind of the forerunner to and for the "networked society." This is the perfect subject for comparative study since all PSM organisation confront comparable difficulties Comparison facilitates the formation of typologies by allowing for the identification of both differences and similarities, as well as trends and innovations in policymaking 2010). Due to the dearth of comprehensive comparative research efforts in this area is necessary. Furthermore, the absence of theoretical analysis in media policy studies is often questioned. We offer pertinent research from our comparative analysis in this chapter and (re-)interpret it via the lens of the network paradigm.

The chapter starts with a survey of the literature to explain how the network paradigm has been used to PSM research. We identify several viewpoints (methodological, conceptual, and practical) and take into account well-known buzzwords that focus on various facets of the network idea. Following a description of our research's methodology and design, we give

several important results that are particularly relevant to the book's main topic. Finally, we assess the utility of the network idea as a theoretical approach for PSM research and make judgements about the present status of PSM in the "network era" based on empirical data.

**The network paradigm and public service media**

In recent years, the network paradigm has gained popularity across a wide range of social science academic fields. Its main benefits come from promoting in-depth analysis of the "ties connecting any two, three or more individuals, organisations, or institutions" as opposed to focusing only on the unique qualities of a study topic or object. Given that social interactions are "key to explain both individual actions and collective outcomes," particularly unanticipated policy effects, network theorists believe that studying social relations is of utmost importance. However, our analysis of the literature revealed that the network concept has actually been used in a variety of ways, often in conflict. We suggest three applications of the network paradigm for PSM research in light of this review:

1) To talk about how PSM uses the internet;
2) To explain a deeper transformation that affects PSM; and
3) To place PSM organisations in connection to national and international (stakeholder)-networks.

Some believe that the rise in popularity of the network paradigm is mostly a trend in academia brought on by new mathematically based technical-analytical methods, such as network analysis.Researchers may utilise these new techniques to quantify and validate clusters rather than figuratively stating that groups are "closely-knit" or that individuals "act in isolation" . According to this viewpoint, the paradigm is a set of methodological tools for visualising "relational thinking," which has a long history in the social sciences, rather than a "proper" theory or even a novel approach.

According to a different viewpoint, the network paradigm has gained popularity because it aids in understanding how reality is always changing. Researchers began identifying new types of political behaviours in particular that blur the distinction between public and private governance and contradict the historical propensity to favour centralised planning. Rapidly evolving, dynamic, and international "issue and protest networks" are replacing the theory and practise of stable policy networks with constrained and regulated membership often made up of governmental agencies, professionals, think tanks, and academics.

ICT's involvement in network development is highlighted by researchers who don't typically study media and communications ICT has "enabled a significant increase in the capacity of networks that are no longer bounded geographically," according to Barry Gibson  The term "social network" has long been used to refer to a group of connected individuals, but thanks to ICT, it has come to refer to a variety of technological platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, Weibo, etc.) that people use to organise bottom-up politics or share information

The network paradigm is often used by researchers with a focus on media organisations, although not frequently in terms of technical-analytical techniques. The paradigm is primarily used as a theoretical framework or narrative to explain the disruptive transformations that affect media organisations as a result of digitalization. It is used for qualitative network analysis to analyse media governance.

## CONCLUSION

Audience engagement and content discovery have been significantly impacted by the deployment and use of recommender systems among EBU members. This research focused on the effect, difficulties, and practises of recommender systems inside the EBU network.First off, audience engagement has been greatly improved by recommender systems. EBU members may better serve their audiences' unique tastes and interests by making personalised suggestions, which boosts user happiness and retention. Recommender systems have made it possible for EBU members to provide more customised and relevant content experiences, promoting a closer bond between media platforms and their viewers.

## REFERENCES:

[1] D. Busch, M. B. J. Van Rijn, en M. Louisse, “How single is the single resolution mechanism?”, *Eur. Bus. Law Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.54648/eulr2019025.

[2] J. Parnall, “Recent Progress in the European Broadcasting Union Technical Committee”, *SMPTE Motion Imaging J.*, 2020, doi: 10.5594/JMI.2020.3002306.

[3] R. A. Spence, “The European Banking Union: will it be Sufficient to Avert Another Debt Crisis in Europe?”, *Int. J. Bus. Soc. Res.*, 2016, doi: 10.18533/ijbsr.v6i11.1011.

[4] Kevin D. Blanchet,“Evidence-Based Urology Gets a Boost”, *BJU Int.*, 2010, doi: 10.1111/j.1464-410x.2010.09777.x.

[5] A. Rose, “Evolution of the BBC iPlayer”, *EBU Tech. Rev.*, 2008.

[6] F. De Jong, D. Driesnack, A. Mason, M. Parmentier, P. Sunna, en S. Thompson, “European athletics championships: Lessons from a live, HDR, HFR, UHD, and next-generation audio sports event”, *SMPTE Motion Imaging J.*, 2019, doi: 10.5594/JMI.2019.2895582.

[7] F. Kozamernik, “DAB - From digital radio towards mobile multimedia”, *EBU Tech. Rev.*, 2004.