Nataliya Kostenko
Valeriy Ivanov

EXPERIENCE
OF CONTENT ANALYSIS
Models and Practices

The book is published with the support of the International Renaissance Foundation and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe

The book considers methodological and methodical problems of content analysis of mass communication, as well as native and western experiences of content analysis of documents and texts of mass media.

The book is intended for sociologists, journalists, marketing specialists, politicians, students of arts schools

Translation: *Makeyev K.S.*
              Demeshko P.V.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

The experience of content analysis – formalized analysis of the content of documents and messages – belongs to the XX century. After its completion it became especially clear how dramatic and in the long run unprecedentedly successful the history of mass media as a universal mean of embracement and accessibility turned out to be. However, nowadays it would be reasonable to speak not only about success of their mass character and space expansion. Media definitely aspire to the full participation in the system of social and political control not only fulfilling the functions of a power retransmitter but also offering an alternative to their influence. They are able to function as absolutely independent political subjects, joining the movement for democratic transformations, not infrequently in a radical way, or vice versa to disregard political imperatives and culture canon, following exclusively economical aims and own ambitions – to have practically complete domination over key symbols and events. Finally, inherent to the media is the role of a producer and shaper of interaction between social and cultural agents of different levels, they promote global culture or defend local cultural patterns. For the every day life which is no more imaginable beyond media-context, mass media, and especially television are in the first place a source of expert knowledge about the world, political life, and cultural trends. And the new electronic communications produce practices of immediate and ubiquitous interrelationship.

Changes which are brought by mass media in the reality of public and private life already from the beginning of the past century could not stay beyond the attention of journalists, politicians, sociologists who started an active search for how to study and utilize the influence potential of the information media. This work was inspired by the intention of mainly pragmatic character: there seemed to be nothing that could not be turned into a mean of influence, manipulation, change.

As one of the results of this search the analysis of the content of mass communication appeared, that obtained its scientific foundation in the framework of the paradigm of mass media effects measuring that was developed on basis of structural-functional approaches, positivism standards and political practices of liberal pluralism of American type. From the very beginning it was envisaged that the effects of mass

media can be calculated quite exactly and hence be constructed and content-analysis was directed in the first place at the disclosing of latent attitudes of the communicator. Behind the communicator the main players of political space were necessarily seen – institutions, power, ideologies, elites – in short, any domination structures, which in a trivial or subtle way utilized the media-tool in their own interests. In a period of functionalism popularity the effects paradigm got carte blanche, was gradually refined responding to the changes in the life style and interpretation manner. It describes even now some fragments of the media-world undoubtedly adequately, is especially popular with the politicians, and arranges in an understandable way our ideas about the interaction of institutions. In periods of election campaigns it proves its effectiveness as before, and can not but use content-analysis as a tool for observation of advertising and agitation activity.

It is clear that the method of content analysis underwent modifications depending on the evolution of ideas of the essence and possibilities of mass media, their place in the society as well as in routine processes of everyday interaction between people. Hence the variety of concepts and models which put into foreground in the influence structures either psychological, or political or linguistic or semiotic factors. Full tribute was paid also to the enthusiasm for cybernetic models.

In the last quarter of the past century it became absolutely manifest that in the formed at that time configuration of the "media-order" the focus had shifted in the direction of cultural component of the content of communication texts. Transmission of values, normative behaviour and reality perception patterns, and not necessarily according to the rules of traditional and generally accepted culture, brought media to the status of generator of new life styles and ways – status that was impossible to be ascribed before and to what they hardly aspired as to a well-defined end.

This is, strictly speaking, the proper end of the content analysis experience in the twentieth century. The task of the present book, offered to the reader, is simple: to remind of this experience without claims for its complete and full survey, taking into consideration its effectiveness in sociological cognition and journalistic practice. To remind also for that reason that in Ukraine content analysis did not belong to developed researchers' technologies and was elaborated only by few specialists. The talk on the experience is in no way purposing the idea that the possibilities of the method are as if exhausted. Rather vice versa – this

book deals with its undisclosed potential and applicability in the situation of new understanding of mass media, in the situation of an extended selection field of conceptual decisions in the research on the modern media culture.

In addition, the present book is also a textual experience of talking about content-analysis and its practicing. The works and researches of recent years are collected in it and this provides the possibility to learn, reread and, what is the most important, to recomprehend the past achievements and shortcomings in order to go further. The first, third and fourth part are prepared by the sociologist Nataliya Kostenko, the second part – by the researcher in the field of journalism Valeri Ivanov. The authors express their gratitude to the International Renaissance Foundation for support of this publication.

Authors

PART 1.
MASS COMMUNICATION: SOCIAL NATURE AND HISTORICAL CONDITIONALITY

§1. Notion and status of mass communication

The social order is maintained by different mechanisms that function on a scale of society as a whole. First of all it is the question of the social structure – stable aggregate of social subjects in the form of classes, strata, groups, categories of the population and rules of their interaction. That includes also social institutes and organizations which condition, sanction and control the behaviour of single individuals or united in formal or informal communities. On the macrolevel of the social system noticeable influence upon the development of social processes is exerted by the culture that transmits dominating ideals and value hierarchies as well as provides legitimacy to the value criteria of collective and individual consciousness. The specific macromechanism is mass communication. To a considerable extent exactly it ensures the integrity of a human community. The function of mass communication as to maintaining of general and universal connection between people, states and cultures is so important that it enables to speak about "informational" civilization. But connection is not its only function.

In the sociology the mass communication is described in terms of either social communication or social interchange or social interaction. The common in these descriptions is the fact that it is the question of symbolic forms of interrelation in the society that represent the knowledge, values, norms, meanings circulating in the socium – written or audiovisual texts. Thus we can define the mass communication *as the fundamental state of the modern society in which the complex structure of social and cultural space with its numerous sectors, that are related to one another functionally and by deterministic patterns, is embodied in symbolic forms and conceptions, that can be perceived and understood by corporate, mass and individual consciousness*. In such symbols and conceptions regardless of the fact, whether they reflect the realities of life or are a pure illusion, always manifest the dominants, peculiarities, contradictions of the social system, of social order and culture. Such conceptions of the social world are at the same time both substance and object of the interaction between social subjects in mass communication.

The state of mass communication is realized at least on two levels: cognitive and interactive.

The first is connected with the processes of spreading of socially significant information in the audience that involve the main part of the population. On the cognitive level the word "information" is interpreted mostly as "acquaintance". The knowledge of social nature that is broadcasted on the macrocommunication channels (popular knowledge about the world, value coloured behaviour patterns, interaction norms for subjects with different social status, cultural stereotypes) form the information basis for the cognitive activity of social subjects with different ranks. Plunging into mass communication they are able to use the received information as the cognitive instrument in the process of forming their notions, thoughts, value orientations. On this level the conceptions of the socium turn into spontaneously or accidentally formed copies of the scientific or cultural world picture. However, they may be intentionally distorted, inadequate imprints of real processes, which are produced by subjects controlling the institution of mass-media.

The information is sometimes able to stay for a long time in the cognitive layers of collective or individual consciousness. However, in case of its critical comprehension or uncritical perception under the influence of purposive propaganda it is able to knit with the value and norms system of different groups and categories of individuals and be engaged in the regulation of their contacts with the environment. Exactly on the interactive level the information represents the tool of social action in different forms. Having received the information the individual or the group identify themselves with a certain stratum, cultural circle, ethnical community, political movement, i.e., they fulfil social and value identification. By means of the channels of mass communication they symbolically interact and compete for the priority of internalized socium images, participate in the formation of public opinion and mood. The latter in their turn initiate the interaction of the individuals engaged in the social structure in form of different submission, resistance or solidarity acts between social, political and cultural groups.

Macrocommunication processes are realized by means of special tools – mass communication, or mass-media – press, radio, television, cinema, video systems. Thus, mass communication as the state of society is constituted by mass-media, doesn't exist beyond them and only together with them has the features of a social institution. Not only the mass-media are constantly being modernized under the influence of socium requirements to the information and mass communication or

common cultural norms but also due to the producing of new styles of information interaction. The permanent competition between mass media for the spheres of domination confines, specifies or even increases the spatial and social parameters of each of them but doesn't substantially decrease the social need in the existence of such media. Only together they form complex and branched networks in which modern knowledge about the world and value conceptions of this world circulates. However, different is the time during which each of the mass-media is present in the social life; they have distinct prospects for the future, and that is evidence of the historical conditionality of this institution. Even the superficial acquaintance with the historical experience of mass-media enables to trace the acquisition of the institutional status.

Mass communication media

Communication (lat. communicatio – message, transmission) arose from the individual's need for social life and therefore is social by nature. It's an intercourse between people during which they exchange messages, own and other's opinions and feelings by means of language or other signs. Studying "primitive societies" the French ethnographer and sociologist Claude Levi-Strauss determined that the object of social exchange between clans was along with goods and women also information, which according to customs, living rules and self-will of its owner could and had to become social acquisition. However, in such "cold", according to Claude Levi-Strauss, societies the inclination towards producing and consuming of information is notably weaker than in "hot", industrially developed modern structures. Mass communication is the invention of the latter.

It acquires the features and qualities of a social institution gradually. The first mass media was the newspaper (gazette). Its name originates apparently from a bit – gazetta that was paid in Venice in the VI century for a manuscript report about current events. Periodical prints – Dutch "coranto" ("current events"), English "news books", French "La Gazette", i.e., that what we call the press, appeared in Europe already in the first half of the XVII century. In Russia its emergence dates back to 1702 – the appearance of "Vedomosti" of Peter I.

The press reflected political passions and social interests of the groups that dominated in the society. The press was their word, platform from which they proclaimed their ideas and doctrines. The content of the latter could easily be read from stock and foreign news, from the reports

about the high life, from the description of local events. However, the independence of this word overstepped the bounds set by monarchic persons and governments. The wave of new newspapers and political pamphlets caused the decision about the censorship. For example, the Decree of the Long Parliament in England in 1644 had forbidden the rigid criticism of state structures. However, the bourgeois consciousness didn't accept the state control. The idea of press independence arose apparently along with the "third estate" and was clearly expressed by the English poet and politician of the XVII century John Milton: "The state must govern and not criticize me". This idea inspirited democratic requirements as well. And already on the engraving from the time of the Great French Revolution under the name "Freedom of the press" (according to the Declaration of human and citizen's rights of 1789) we can see excited faces of citizens of the First republic swinging with newspapers.

In the 30-40ᵗʰ years of the XIX century the main part of population got access to printed news. In the developed countries of Europe and in the USA the cheap "penny" press became widespread. The French newspaper "La Presse", the English "Daily Telegraph", the American "Sun" began to appear in at that time mass circulation, taking into account the information preferences of the audience. Taking into consideration needs and requirements of the market the production of news and newspapers became more and more industrial by nature. The undisguised prejudicialness and sharpness of the press that served as criteria for effectiveness and expediency of the ideological influence were supplemented by the advertisement and sensationalism which satisfied the informational taste of the reader able to buy the newspaper. However, the relative freedom from the state patronage combined with openness to the imperatives of economic breakeven and profitability. It happened that the spirit of capitalism that is associated with "freedom" conditioned other dependences for the press. The power is embodied by the state-political elite and capital of all kinds which are even today the most important institutions that sanction the concrete ideological and value colouredness of the printed word.

However, the dependence upon the authorities, elitist or financially influential groups was always a burden for the press, hindered it inner communication intentions that in the course of time became stronger and began to be regulated by own rules. These rules rested to a considerable extent upon cultural resources: verbal behaviour patterns, value, norms, and world conceptions. It's not improbable that the autonomy and sovereignty of the press are conditioned by its

belonging to the sphere of language and culture. In the progress of culture and education the press surely played its role spreading culture images and scientific knowledge. In the first half of the XX century in Kharkiv, for example, some enlightening periodicals were published: "Kharkiv Weekly", "Ukrainian Herald", "Kharkiv Democrat", "Ukrainian Housekeeper", "Kharkiv News", "Ukrainian Magazine" that contributed to the formation of spiritual atmosphere in the society. However, the interaction of the press and culture was never distinguished by the full harmony.

It became clear soon that small bright newspaper reports not only have the striking ability to "elucidate the situation" and translate the news of the social life according to the intention of the journalists and publishers but also to create socially significant images of the reality by means of special literature genres, speech clich?s and rules of text producing that differ greatly from those inherent to the traditional book culture. Furthermore, the language of the press gradually began to take into account the specificity of the psychological influence of the word upon the mass public, i.e. the fact that the rational understanding of the text fragment is not necessary. The new style of verbal culture and communication appeared. Its incursion into the cultural tradition and life style of the townsmen became evident at the beginning of the XX century, in the period of newspaper boom. Just imagine: in the USA at that time about 21 thousands of big and small newspapers appear. Culture workers interpreted such a popularity of the press as the cultural "expansion" of the texts, unsuitable for the complex description of reasons and consequences of what is happening, i.e., unsuitable to reproduce the causation of events and states of the political, social and cultural world.

"Nowadays when newspapers have substituted the history, i.e. more precisely, that tradition that can be called historic gossip, – as we can read by the English writer Gilbert Chesterton (the 30th), – it got better at least in one respect. We have at least understood that we know nothing besides the end. The newspapers not only inform about the news – they communicate everything as news. For example, Tutankhamun turned out to be absolutely new. In the same way, from the messages about the death of General Bangs we have learned that he was born. After the war we have learned about liberated nations; we have, however, never heard that they were subjugated. They constantly talk about reconciliation; however, we know nothing about the variance. We have no time to busy ourselves with such boring things as Serbian epos – it is more exciting to discuss on modern jargon the problems of Yugoslavian diplomacy.

We are attracted by that what is called Czechoslovakia but we pass Bohemia by. Things, old as Europe, are given us as sensations which do not yield in their freshness to the recent messages about the life in American prairies. It is interesting in the same way as the last scene of the play. Those who are satisfied by the shot or embrace come best of all at the time the curtain falls. But if you want to learn who killed whom, who kissed whom and why – that is too little" [1].

Those "who are satisfied by the shot" formed meanwhile a mass audience and exactly them Marina Tsvetayeva called those who "swallow the emptiness" and "chew the mastic" what can be interpreted as a hint at the absence of cultural meanings and sense in newspaper texts. The ambiguous status of the press as an inexhaustible source of information and as a mean with the help of which the consciousness of the audience members becomes commonplace, becomes filled with stereotypes passed to other mass media whose technological secret and possibilities opened new prospects for connection and communication but didn't eliminate the contradictions. In order to be mass, i.e. to be perceived by the greatest possible quantity of people the information must concentrate the senses and gain forms in the space between original and banal, spreading public social meanings and symbols.

At the beginning of the XX century the family of mass media was reinforced by the radio that has quickly demonstrated the unique ability to unite the inhabitants of territories separated and isolated by military operations of the World War I. In Ukraine, the first radio broadcast was put on air in 1924. The radio broadcasting included to the audience the country-side whose habit to this source and orientation on what was "communicated on the radio" are still relatively stable at least in our society. As the sociological surveys carried out in the 80th showed, people in the countryside listen to the radio more often than watch TV.

The radio waves have substantially decreased the time of news delivery from the centres to the periphery. Capitals and cities drew near to small settlements and that changed the idea about the overcoming not only of the geographical but also of social space. However, the television had even greater effect. Having started its "epoch" in the system of mass media in the 30th, already after 30 years it was comprehended in the scientific, cultural, political and everyday reflection as the almighty tool of influence on the consciousness and way of life. Audiovisual images that had before been the prerogative of the cinema (also a specific mass communication medium) turned into top-priority by its significance, easiness of adoption and attraction bearer of social information.

Millions of people in different regions of the world became simultaneously witnesses of the most important events that happened in whatever places. The world of politics and science became visually personified and the viewers began to recognize the faces of their leaders. The art is delivered to the house. Economical achievements, state activity, foreign affairs, sport successes and finally the weather in London or Vladivostok – everything became visible. The mass audience that was communicated the news immediately and that was captured by the television effect of "presence on the scene" turned them to the subject of discussion in the professional environment, circle of friends and acquainted. Exactly in such way these events became part of the historical and social experience of people having the chance to turn into the phenomenon of collective consciousness.

The accessibility of mass communication media, intelligibility of the knowledge about the world provided the possibility of relative levelling of different by their social and status characteristics groups regarding the grade of their awareness of the social life. However, the interpretations, estimations, value substantiation of the television reports could not be identical. The audience in front of the television screens had split depending on their ability to pick up interesting and important information, to handle it critically, to trust to the source, to adequately perceive and understand the sense embodied in a symbolic form, to be insensitive to the suggestive and manipulation influence of the communicators and so on, i.e., the audience had split according to the different social, socio-cultural and psychological peculiarities of its members.

In the 70-80th, not having finally found out what television is: "magician" who is creating reality in our presence or "monster" that is forming a "one-dimensional" man with an unpretentious taste and consciousness filled with stereotypes and clich?s, the social reflection was confronted with the problem to evaluate radical changes in mass communication. The spreading of electronic communication facilities, satellite and cable television, video equipment put the man in dependence upon the dense communication network. The audiovisual communication is a constant factor of people's life and the world created by it and claiming for reality is able to compete with the actual reality. As the research of the American sociologist George Gerbner showed, "passionate television viewers incline to describe the reality – its social structure, interrelations between statuses, occupational groups, representatives of different genders, criminality level – in the way it is presented by the television" [2].

The technical potential of "new" mass media provides the possibility to broadcast audiovisual images easily over any distance. The residents of Ukraine, for example, are able to get the news from information programs of the biggest American TV company CNN. However, today such information variability creates a number of problems for the national television. Aspiring at the monopoly in the information sphere powerful TV networks and TV services are able to offer and spread among the mass audience their own views on the world, cultivate their own cultural models and behaviour patterns. This causes a complex interaction of cultures that is not always carried out on the principle of a "dialog". Such phenomena as diffusion, mutual complementation, rejection, domination and competition of innovative and traditional patterns are inherent to it. The latter (traditional patterns) are object of protection in national states. Another sphere of the state regulation is the progressive commercialization of TV programs, the glut of advertisement, and the expansion of commercial telecasting stations network.

One may get the impression that the audiovisual and computerized mass media have completely monopolized the social communication depriving traditional sources of the possibility to inform and communicate. There is a multitude of scientific conceptions that consider the prospects of the society taking into account the technological might of electronic communication media and their ability to subordinate social phenomena and processes. In particular, the Canadian sociologist Marshall McLouen adheres to such position. However, even today the press and radio still are the common channels for the audience to get acquainted with the news and evaluation of events. In Sweden, for example, the party press is rather popular. The news about inner-party relations as well as relations between parties is usually received from newspapers rather than from the TV programs.

In the mid 90th, due to the pluralisation of political movements the similar situation may also be observed in Ukraine. In contrast to the television that is stately or commercially subordinated the press is the most accessible tool of propaganda of views and ideas for parties.

The status of mass media

Considering the mass media from the standpoint of legitimation of their status in the system of social institutions we can, thus, describe them as the aspiration of the medium (i.e., the tool of retelling and spreading the information which is important for different social groups

and categories) to broaden the predetermined status borders and attain the institutional autonomy. To some extent this aspiration is realized. However, the institutional relations of mass media are quite complex and the effectiveness of their functioning in the socium, the participation in the processes of social differentiation and social integration depend upon to what extent their aspiration for independence combines with, is consistent with as well as is opposed to the influence, pressure and aspirations of other institutions. These dependences may be sketched out as follows:

1. Mass media are exposed to the control from the institution of power (state, ruling elite, political parties). This control is exercised by means of state regulation, censorship mechanisms, ideological pressure of different political and authority formations. In democratic societies the rigid forms of mass media submission to the authorities that are inherent to a totalitarian regime are replaced by more "mild" and "weighted" ones.

2. Mass media are exposed to the pressure of economic structures, capital, commercial circles which are oriented on the functioning of mass media as profitable industrial complexes that manufacture information and entertaining products designed for mass consumption. The transformation of the mass media system into one of the branches of modern production demands considerable investments into the improvement and development of macrocommunication technologies.

3. Influence upon the mass communication is exerted by the institutional culture as well which sanctions the transmission of values, norms, life styles of certain social groups as well as of the society as a whole which are legitimated by it. For a successful functioning in different socio-cultural environments mass media reproduce and spread cultural patterns of everyday life.

4. Rather complex is the relationship of mass media and public opinion. For the description of the former the metaphors "voice of the people" and "the fourth authority" are often used owing to which mass communication media appear as the mouthpiece of public opinion. These metaphors are evoked by the imperatives and intentions of a democratic consciousness, this, however, doesn't guarantee that the public will abandon the instrumental approach to the press and television and give up the attempts to exert influence upon them.

5. Vitally important for the institution of mass media is taking into account informational, communication, relaxation needs and interests of the audience. The latter doesn't have significant institutional features. It is heterogeneous in socio-cultural respect and

is geographically distributed. However, as social subject it notifies of its tastes which determine the level of general accessibility of the translated knowledge, conditions the semiotic and psychological comprehensibility of the information, forms the appropriate expectations from the mass media. Exactly in such quality the audience exerts influence upon mass communication media.

The enumerated dependences don't exclude the freedom and autonomy of mass media regarding conservation, strengthening and reconsideration of the bases of the existing social order. Mass media have special functions in socio-cultural processes on the cognitive and interactive levels:

– to articulate the conceptions of social structure, social differentiation, values of social stratification or, vice versa, egalitarism;
– to transmit and cultivate the images of social strata and statuses, to further or hinder the increase of their prestige;
– to realize the socio-cultural structuration of the audience confirming special socio-cultural statuses of the amateurs of political TV programs, entertaining genres or, as we could observe, the structuration of the audience into the readers of the magazine "Novy mir" (New world) who were oriented on the transformation of the society and the readers of the magazine "Nash sovremennik" (Our contemporary) with more traditionalistic views;
– to reinforce bygones or represent new styles of communication between individuals and groups, types of social interaction.

In addition to the participation in macroscale processes the mass communication roots in the everyday life maintaining the interrelation of public and everyday spheres by means of familiarizing of spatially distributed individuals with the information which is significant for the society. Describing and interpreting the phenomenon of mass communication we necessarily face the phenomena of cultural, semiotic and psychological nature. However, now we are interested in how it is cognized by the sociology.

§2. Paradigms of mass communication research

Different communication phenomena attract attention of different liberal arts and information theories: philosophy and culture studies, sociology and psychology, linguistics and semiotics, cybernetic approaches to the analysis of social processes. Exactly on the

achievements of these sciences the modern knowledge about macro communication rests and its study ("mass communication research") inclines nowadays to the detachment into one interdisciplinary science branch directed to the research of communication situations at a global and local scale, to the determination of social, cultural, political tendencies, consequences and prognoses of their development. This hinders in no way the sociological specification of the subject. The latter foresees that the most significant principles and means of an analytical approach to macro communication states, mechanisms or processes are formed on basis of the sociological theory and methodology. The more so since the terminological restrictions and prohibitions that were dictated by the language of each single science nowadays are almost removed or less rigid than before.

Mass communication was never ignored by the sociology. As Max Weber in his article "To the sociology of the press" emphasized, the problem of the press research lies in the determination of its attitude towards existing political parties, business world, numerous groups and interests that exert influence upon the public and experience the reverse influence. Any conceptions and models developed by the mass communication sociology do not avoid this problem. The theoretical and methodological prospects, however, from the standpoints of which the researchers observe, explain or interpret the macro communication reality differ greatly. In sociology some paradigms of mass communication research were formed, provided that under paradigm we understand, following the American philosopher and science historian Thomas Kun, the theoretical and empiric models recognized by the scientific community that turned out to be able to lay the foundation of further systematical researches. Reflections on such paradigms must take into account the peculiarities of the European and American scientific mentality, the devotion of paradigm creators to certain theoretical directions and schools.

The most important feature of these paradigms is the articulation of the attitude to the concept "mass society". It either is acknowledged to play the fundamental role in the explanation of mass communication or it is used with some reservations, or they reject it as irrelevant for the description and analysis of the macro communication state of the society. The choice of an attitude to this concept is at the same time the choice of a thesis about the strength or weakness of mass media institutions as to their influence on value systems of the social consciousness, on the social structure, social order and human individuality. When simplified this thesis has two variants: 1) almighty mass communication media realizing the interests of prestigious social groups exert total influence

upon the inert and passive audience, inculcating in them the required views, opinions and habits; 2) mass media limited by the system of social institutions don't lose their autonomy and therefore are able to exert only a partial influence upon the consciousness and behavior of the public which is socially heterogeneous and differentiated according to the extent of its involvement in the communication.

The ideas of "omnipotence", total, "irreversible" influence of the mass media or vice versa their socially restricted effect existed and still exist concurrently in the sociology. Another matter is, however, that in certain periods of the increase of popularity of certain scientific schools and approaches one of these ideas was in favor. The dominant changed more than once reminding of how deeply these ideas had rooted in the sociological thought.

The diversity of scientific approaches to the explanation of the social role of the media is not astonishing. "The great medium" acts between people and institutions with their culture, between political, economical and historical currents, between private and public spheres of life, elitist and mass consciousness. But, to what extent does it mediate the content of the interaction and whether it is so universal? Or whether the media are "means as means", tools for knowledge, values and dominations delivery that should be evaluated utilitarianly?

The cognitive intrigue of the questions of this kind hasn't disappeared since the time they had been formulated at the end of the past century. Nowadays it is only increasing. Free and powerless as to their conception media constantly turn out to be close to their contrary identities. In the course of recent decades the situation became even more difficult for analysis if we take into consideration radical changes in the media systems themselves, the spreading of electronic communication media as well as considerable transformations in modern societies. The inclination towards theoretical constructs of a certain style entails facts withholding and doubts in conclusions regarding media reality and "media in other realities" – political, cultural, everyday. The classical mass communication models turn out to be extremely effective as to single cases but sometimes they are not able to interpret large socium segments. The modern sociological narrativity trusts in increasing frequency the refined discourse if it is argued by the factualness acquired through concrete observations. And the factualness, i.e. certain aspects of a media situation, is so that it confirms and at the same time denies conventional models and concepts [3].

In the famous "Mass Communication Theory" D. McQuail is constructing a rather detailed multiparadigmal picture of views upon the mass media within a context of culture and society [4]. There is actually

a multitude of positions for the intellectual movement from which the mass media can be overlooked rather well. The chosen position "from the inside" opens the media-centric perspective, "from the outside" – the socio-centric one, according to McQuail. In both cases culturological and materialistic approaches are possible. There also different types of mass media and communication theories – social, normative, operational, behaviour theory. There are also certain scientific traditions such as structural, cultural, behavioural. And accordingly – a sizeable package of mass communication models and concepts which are known and little known to domestic researchers [6].

Analytically it is allowably to consider the mass media from the standpoint of each constituent of a communicative act – social producer, be it political elites, business circles or the servants of the media themselves; discourse content, i.e. social meaning and culture, and finally the audience, i.e. social structure and everyday life. Meanwhile each constituent foresees necessarily the rest since ontologically the mass communication consists exactly in their evident or latent concatenation and interrelation. The acknowledgement of the autonomy and isolation of existence of these structures doesn't destroy this interrelationship and the demonstrative idiosyncrasy or indifference to each other is only the reverse side of their correlation. It doesn't lie in the nature of sociological imagination to lose sight of this. Since mass communication, according to an apt definition of G. Gerbner, is "social interaction through message" [6].

The subject specifications necessarily respond to the problem of the social order. The review of the problem in the humanistic spirit or within a context of the new normativeness doesn't abolish the challenge to the intellectuals at all that is revealed by the historically childish find of the sociology. Regarding mass communication and media the sociological thought is centring around the concepts of "dominance" and "control". Variations and recent interpretations of these concepts are able to initiate their own prospects and paradigms which finally appeal to the images of modern society.

The paradigm of "total" influence

In this or that way this paradigm is present in socio-philosophical and sociological theories of mass society and mass culture. Notwithstanding the fact that the ideas of "mass society" belong to a considerable extent to the past of sociological thought nowadays they find new metaphors (e.

g., "consuming society") which mean the existence of the social space undifferentiated in traditional way (in classes, strata, groups). Along with such an amorphous segment of the social structure another one is often meant at the same time which is responsible for social and cultural order – the elite. As special constituent the elites are also present in other concepts of society structuration but in the theories of mass society and mass culture the dilemma "mass – elitist" is necessarily accentuated. Exactly its discussion imparted tension to the first concepts of that kind. Their genealogy traces back to the middle of the XIX century and, on the whole, they evaluate the progress of mass media pessimistically considering them as a threat to elitist cultural values on the one hand and to the cultural autonomy of a single individual on the other hand. The conceptual shaping of the European sociological thought concerning the break-up of "organic commonness" of the capitalism, incapacity of the classical rationality and educational system, idealized by Enlightenment, came about in the course of adoption and reinterpretation of the romantically conservative reflection to which we may relate the cultural theories of Mathew Arnold and Thomas Sterns Eliot and later – of Friedrich Nietzsche and Jose Ortega y Gusset, political doctrines of John Stewart Mill and Alexis de Tocqueville, the Italian school of sociologist and mass psychology researchers. The expansion of mass culture aroused anxiety about infringement of the "natural" balance between elite and mass in favour of the latter, about formation of conditions for cultivating of mediocre moral and intellectual qualities, transformation of political democracy under pressure of irrational forces of the crowd, the involvement of even more people in vulgar forms of the high culture. The heyday of the "realm of masses" also was considered to become problematic since the corner stones of its structure – the individuals – turned into a faceless victim of manipulation by the social element or of the premeditation of the elites.

In the sociology at the beginning of the XX century and especially after the World War I when the radio and press audience increased distinctly it (audience) was considered according to the main characteristic of the "mass" formulated in the concepts and topics of "mass society". The audience members were considered by researchers as passive consumers unable to make an independent informational choice. Against the background of the estrangement of an inhabitant of urbanized settlements from traditional values, mass audience appeared defenceless against the information flow and those producing and translating it. Mass media are shooting a "verbal bullet" that penetrates into the moldering consciousness of the recipient. The researcher has

only to determine the penetration depth by means of existing methods. The researcher's credo of that time is described exactly in this way.

The pessimism concerning mass society and mass culture didn't fade away. In the 30th, it was expressively demonstrated by the theoreticians of the Frankfurter school reacting to the emergence of fascism and reflecting upon the incapacity of German society to resist it. The propagandistic machine of the Nazi regime effectively applied the depersonalizing mechanisms of mass culture. Its consequences were terrible considering the irreversible transformation of the human individuality to a creature that obediently allows making propagandistic injections to its consciousness. After the war in their work "The Dialectics of the Enlightenment" devoted to the criticism of the man-subjugating rationality that maims social connections and causes the autodecomposition of the European civilization Max Horkheimer and Theodore Adorno uttered their negative attitude toward the achievements of modern culture industry and mass media in the sphere of social consciousness integration and evaluated the latter as regress.

The Effects of mass media

Another paradigm belongs completely to the experience of sociology and is often called the paradigm of the effects of mass media since it assumes discourse about the results of media influence. It is certainly the political, social and cultural influence of the elites though the media themselves can also be considered as such. The history of this paradigm from P. Lazarsfeld to G. Clapper was analyzed in the literature more than once [7]. Originated in American sociology of propaganda and public opinion of the 1930th the paradigm of the effects of mass media in the 1950-1980th becomes "common knowledge", or "conventional wisdom" [8], afterwards, however, it was pushed out on the periphery of communication research. However, the interrogative inflexions of Lasswell's influence formula (who transmits for whom, by what channel and with what effect) still remain since they were never completely exhausted [9]. The very idea to measure the effects of mass media attracts by the possibility to determine quite easily the situation – do they influence so or not – that appears sometimes absolutely necessary in the explanations of the domination success of subjects and values, of monitoring mechanisms and functions of media. The simplicity lies in the fact that the interaction is conventionally reduced to the influence which can be represented by a vector and therefore we can build the linear

logic of factualness elimination. The fact that the empirical instruments are well tooled is undoubtedly a convincing side of this paradigm.

The stronger tradition of the effects paradigm foresees one of the standpoints of the dilemma "strong media and weak audience" or, vice versa, i.e. – the inclination of media to limited effects, at the best reinforcing social attitudes, which are present in the audience, but hardly able to change them. The audience, in its turn, is nor a homogenous mass. It is a socially stratified formation with an active selection capability to perceive information (Lazarsfeld, Clapper). Moreover, it is so active that the manipulation vector may turn in the reverse direction – from the audience to media. That is why the influence upon it by the elitist groups utilizing media is not considered as a peremptory obtrusion of patterns on the recipient. However, the latter is not excluded but refers rather to the techniques, manner and style of propaganda. The effectiveness of macrocommunication process as well as single effects of the influence are evaluated according to the criteria of social control – from rigid forms of social regime maintenance to mild regulation of the value sphere.

The subsequent elaboration of "multistage communication models" [10], concepts of "co-variation" of discourse flows of the media, elite and audience, of "utilization and satisfaction" of the media as the public's strategy for relaxation [11] attest the insistent perfection of the paradigm of the effects that becomes more and more inconvenient in the research of the audience's reaction to the pressure of media reality.

As an alternative to the limited effects of mass communication the total effect was always meant. Before as well as after the keenness on the measurements of the vain efforts of mass media to change the attitudes of the electorate, researchers started with and returned to such an alternative: powerful media and the audience which is rather passive and falls easily under influence. It is clear that the concept of ideas injection into the consciousness of a victim that doesn't suspect anything is a matter of the past [12]. But in the 1970th, the cultivation analysis of Gerbner unequivocally pointed out the direct influence of media – even if for a single case of television viewers who were maximally involved in the screening and were represented the television world picture that instils fear of criminality [13]. And the concept of "the spiral of silence" of E. Noelle and her followers revealed the key role of the media in formation of the climate of opinions [14].

The question about the effectiveness remains open. The factualness fixed by empirical researches in different societies, ethnical and geographical sections provides arguments both in favour of the media

and the audience. To some extent the classical dilemma of their power and weakness ceases to inspire researchers who constantly add new socio-cultural variables to the description of mass communication and do not jump to conclusions on its results. However, the paradigm of the effects is still stimulating politicians and advertisers. And who but they knows for certain the ways to domination.

"The two-stage model" of mass communication

The search of the selective behaviour of people was also carried out outside the borders outlined by the behaviouristic thesis "stimulus — reaction" (where the content of mass communication was considered able to exert an immediate and direct influence upon the individual and impel him to respond). It was not unreasonable to assume that in the world of communication, in addition to the mass communication flow, there are other flows which accompany it or oppose with it – the flows born in interpersonal contacts. In the work "The Personal Influence" that appeared in 1955 Katz and Lazarsfeld developed a "two-stage model of mass communication". The macrocommunication process was structured in two stages: at first, the mass media messages are perceived by the active part of the audience – "opinion leaders" and then transmitted from them by interpersonal channels to the passive part indifferent to radio and newspapers. Such ideas, however, were expressed already in the 40th when during empirical researches on the mass media role in the election campaign no evidential confirmations were found of the fact that the propagandistic efforts of the press and radio exert noticeable influence upon the voting results. In that period people, as Lazarsfeld noted, "showed inclination to vote so as always, in fact so as they families always did" [15].

The fact that the macrocommunication reality arises not in an isolated space but wedges itself in the social world with inherent to it complex relations between the subjects and objects of pithy and important information seemed an acceptable assumption. Interest in the interpersonal component in mass communication was consonant with the increasing attention of sociology toward social interaction, toward interactional approaches and role theories. "The two-stage model" was based on the hypothesis that regarding mass communication the individuals adhere to different social roles. Some of them are active in the perception and spreading of knowledge and values communicated by mass media. It is undoubtedly connected with their

statuses, communicative abilities of a personality, regular contacts with newspapers and radio. The others are rather inert in the communication with mass media and therefore use more often informal sources or message retelling by the leaders of a referential group. Thus the influence of mass communication is not always direct and immediate. It rather passes through sluices and mediation of the social environment of the individuals.

The nonlinear two-stage structuration of the mass information flow stimulated the subsequent theoretical modelling of macrocommunication processes and empirical verification of these models. However, both the "effects paradigm" on the whole whose ideas gravitated towards conceptions of the limited, partial influence of mass media upon the structure and content of knowledge, value orientations and behaviour of people and the "two-stage model" underwent, in the course of time, refining and reconsideration. The social practice had exhausted the possibilities for its fruitful application.

Relative political stability of the post-war world yielded the place to a more considerable mobility of party interests and party advantages. In the social climate of the 60th the "doctrine of the reinforcement" of political effects of mass media loses its interpretational status. As for the "two-stage model", its postulate about "indirect" effects of mass communication was called into question first of all by the development of television. It was noticed that the "opinion leaders" are not necessarily the link between audience and television that exerts immediate influence upon the individual. That didn't exclude interpersonal discussion of television news and articulated problems. The process of their spreading was rather understood as a "multistage" one that also included alternative communicative currents. New models of functionalistic type began to consider the component of socio-psychological "advantage" and "satisfaction" for description of the attitude of individuals to the information. In other words, people reconstruct in the models that, what they see and hear, according to their own interests, values, social role.

Aiming at implanting of mass communication into the system of public opinion formation new interpretations of ideas of congruency and cognitive balance were created. In particular, in the 70th G. McLeod and S. Chuffi produced the model of "co-orientation" that explained the interaction of elites, mass communication media and public taking into consideration the fact that the public acquires knowledge about problems on the basis of its own experience, elitist sources and mass media. The reference to mass communication media becomes

especially relevant in the situation of tension between elite und societies each of which makes efforts to control mass communication.

In the geographical space of the former USSR the 70th were the most fruitful years as for the research of the mass communication phenomenon. At that time the models of structural-functionalistic type were applied and modified under consideration of traditional and recent researches. As general theoretical basis Marxism was used where mass media are considered in the system of ideological institutions which are at the disposal of dominating classes and which, according to Carl Marx, "regulate the production and distribution of opinions of their time". Considerable contributions to the study of this problematic were made by Boris Grushin, Valeri Korobeynikov, Maryu Lauristin, Boris Firsov and others. The results of their researches are summarized in the book "Mass information in soviet industrial city" [16]. In the 80th, Ukrainian researchers entered into working up of this sphere [17].

In the 60-70th the search for that what limits the political effectiveness of mass media slackens slightly, in addition to this fact the interest in measurement of their direct and indirect influence upon the audience is practically exhausted even in the oriented on positivistic culture American sociology. At the beginning of the 70th Polish researcher P. Sztompka carried out a survey of 152 professors from 21 US universities finding out their major. He found out that the mass communication topics occupy almost the last place, far behind methods and technique of sociological research, social psychology, social changes, stratification and mobility. In the scientific literature more and more emphasis is laid on the necessity of "new strategies in the reconsideration of mass media effects", "new view on political communication" and there are even appeals to return to the concept of omnipotence of mass communication media. The latter is not astonishing in the light of impetuous advance of audiovisual electronic information and communication media.

§3. Media in the modern world

Communication without communication

The concepts of domination and control don't disappear from postclassical social prospects in the views on mass media. Vice versa, they are more expressively defined in the terms of power. Postmodernism supplements to it the vocabulary of satisfaction and the cultural now. Moreover, the control mechanisms are considered as

on principle different from direct ideological influence. Media and in the first place television present to the public an absolutely autonomous sensual-sign reality that fascinates or repels by its verisimilitude augmenting "realism phantasms" (Lotar) and that is perceived physically as sensation. Inspired by technology and cultural progress such reality constantly multiplies, demonstrates the infinity of transformations that occur to signs and does not let bulky meanings and senses overstep their borders. The world that constitutes media is, according to Z. Bauman, "split into the infinity of mini-dramas, has no preciseness or direction. The world itself is pliant – the time in it can easily be brought back and the episodes filling it can be rearranged in any required order" [18]. The only thing uniting these numerous sign versions of reality is their concurrent presence, their virtuality, i.e. existence that is factually registered by the senses and is not eliminated even if the rationality calls its existence in doubt.

In its all-sufficiency the reality-imitation doesn't participate in competition for verity with any other reality that could be identified as "genuine". It avoids any discourse about differences between truth and mendacity, real and imagined, in addition, it does not allude that "the map engenders the territory and not vice versa" but rather that meditations on reality of both of them are, according to Baudrillard, not legitimate [19].

The social control through allurement of media-signs or the "power of simulacra" – according to a metaphor of Deleuze, is not more modest in its claims for totality than the pressure of any authorities. It goes so far that important social events are initiated exceptionally by the possibility of telephotography. As to the audience so it turns into consumer of alluring signs which present the media-message simultaneously as text, thing and commodity. The variety of images and offered sensations becomes similar to a market space where the choice of reaction to the differences may be plainly observed but their intangibility and excessiveness fascinate and prevent from stopping. The power of simulacra does not subjugate the voluntariness of the individual choice openly; it rather exploits the freedom of perception and therefore the control without compulsion is carried out in the easier and cheaper way [20]. The consumer remains with these things-signs t?te-?-t?te. Since personal expending of everything including physical reactions is his major duty and gratification he feels no great need for communication with others. Communication as transmission of meanings is eliminated from mass communication [21]. Finally the social reality washed out by the destruction of discourse connections "disappears" (Baudrillard) or at the best the social is atomized into a "flexible system of language games" (Lotar).

The disappearance of social reality of course does not happen exactly in this way. Without delving deep into discussion we should mention that from the idea of reality presentation through susceptibility to physical values the reverse postmodernist thesis was formulated – rather about the generation of the social or, according to Bourdieu, about "constant carrying of social realities into physical world" [22]. Following him we may assume that operating with signs, simple nominations (for example, names of countries or trade marks), sounds and colours, the media stimulate the inherent to individuals "taste for sociality" that "… transforms differences, incorporated in physical order, into a social order of significant, labelled differences" [23]. And that is one of the ways in which media offer their symbolical classifications of world and society.

Apart of this fact the inclination of media (including domestic) to the creation of discrete, not correlative images of socium and history, to polyvariant judgments, to the multitude of styles and playing with text fragments finds its best explanations in the post-structuralistic prospect. It can also partly interpret why the all-absorbing irony and the manner of epatage evaluations that have no mercy even for news are accepted in mass communication as equivalents of sense. Or why television completely possesses names and symbols disposing of them as if against the tasks of elites and in the sake of the rhythm of sign transformations.

In the post-modernistic paradigm of Baudrillard the culture and mass communication are described in the modality of the now and the media – as "completed", determined, or "fulfilled". "We live in a world – Baudrillard states – where the highest function of the sign is to make the reality disappear and to disguise this disappearance. The same is done today by the art. The same is done by the media. That's why they are doomed to the same fate" [24]. Ideal patterns of the order are surely not cultivated here. However, social theorization offers an absolutely different approach elaborated in the modality of the "appropriate" which analyzes the society in the prospect "between facts and norms". Thus in the media as an element of social system potential resources are seen which can and must be used in the sake of the social well-being.

Media and public sphere

Contrary to the latter the communicative paradigm of the media is grounded on the possibility of their participation in the rationally mediated linguistic communication. According to the theory of Habermas, to the

living world voluntary communicative actions are inherent which are directed to the mutual understanding of subjects. Exactly they further the rational social discourse by means of which the identity of the public sphere is asserted and social integration becomes accessible as "real intersubjective interrelationship of people" [25]. In the institutionalized mass communication such actions are rare and causal. Communicative potential of the media is noticeably restricted by the imperatives of system and organization. However, the social control that is produced through the media has an ambivalent character since they remain open to the verbally mediated understanding. Media "create technical amplifiers of language communication that surmount time and space distances and multiply the possibilities of communication thickening the network of communicative action but not disentangling at all the action orientations in the contexts of living world" [26]. The public sphere, similar to the living world as a whole, is also reconstituted by communicative action; and not owing to its common functions or susceptibility to the content of everyday communication as reference to social space generalized in the communicative act [27]. Media are able to articulate such reference to the social space spreading public discourse on wide areas. Not only is such mechanism wishful for a civil society but it is vitally necessary. To what extent is the resource of language which is freed and used by modern media open to the public sphere?

The situation is really problematic. Since the media become more and more complex and expensive, effective communication channels are centralized more intensively, concentrating control of increasing information flows in "one hands" within a centralized structure. The process of information selection for its representation to the public, as Habermas emphasizes, becomes the source of the power of a new kind. Such power of media is not eliminated by professional standards but submits in some way to constitutional regulation. However, owing to their professionalism, financial and technical supply the media define their political prejudices themselves; and images of politics which are today represented by television are per se its original product. Therefore media turn into an independent subject on the political scene. However, they produce strategies of information process mainly as market strategies. As a result the syndrome of "depolitization" of communication emerges: the displacement of socially significant topics [28]. The cooperation of media with the public sphere whose activation depends substantially upon the extent of their participation turns out to be difficult.

In such context absolutely understandable are both sober calculation of the possibilities of the future electronic newspaper to

perform the "enlightening" function in democratic society [29] and "normative" reflection on the new might of mass media in competition for public influence. As a basis for professional journalistic codex, to which the journalists in post-totalitarian societies appeal in increasing frequency, serves the idea of ethnical self-consciousness of the media as mouthpiece of educated public able to work for the civil interest, to teach the public to make a though-out choice and to involve them in the democratic process, to "respect" the audience and put up resistance to the forces of pressure [30]. Whether such an educational project will further the neutralization of the new power of the media, real formation of the citizenship identity and mobilization of the public sphere, is a difficult question.

The postclassical paradigms broaden the borders of the view on media in the space of culture and power of modern society placing emphasis on different mechanisms of their control over social knowledge and social action. In spite of the fact that they are not "purely sociological", if we consider as such those which have pattern of systematic tracing of facts, these paradigms also direct an absolutely empirical search in the definition of mass communication. The widespread researches of perception and interpretation of media texts by ethnical and socio-cultural groups undoubtedly have such a tendency [31]. For sociology, however, the question still remains important – and what exactly do the individuals do with their interpretations of media texts, how, where and when do they apply them constructing and assimilating the social world, i.e. in what way do the undoubtedly influential at the macro scale of culture and society media regulate not only the public but also the private sphere of life, how do they structure the every day life.

In attempts to understand and explain the pluralistic contemporaneity as well as the media as one of its founders and one of its symbols it is relevant to address all listed paradigms unfolding each in the study of certain contexts and phenomena of macrocommunicative world. Meanwhile, all three paradigms have coinciding contexts, especially interesting in connection with mass communication analysis in the Ukrainian society. One of these contexts – the interaction of the identities of citizens and consumers which is able to produce social tension and which in many respects is determined by participation of the media in identification practices of individuals and groups. For Ukrainian society such a problem is relatively new since as a matter of fact both identities of consumers and citizens are hardly activated in the situation of radical social transformations, establishing of an independent state and market economy structures. They become established in different rhythms and appear in different forms. But

before we may state a problem, even in general outline, we should mention one more prospect. That is the prospect of the global.

Legitimation of the global

New Ukrainian mass media were established in the process of system changes of the society which coincided in time with the globalization flow and are involved in both processes from the very beginning. Methodologically it is admittable – as we could deduce from discussions about globalization – to describe the factualness of Ukrainian media following the thesis about "the universalism of particularities and particularism of the universal" [32]. The thesis applies to the general questions of the social life in the first place concerning the contradictions between increasing economic integration on a regional and global scale and inextinguishable ethnical tensions within national states [33]. In our case, in addition to the homogenization of social patterns, ideas, senses and styles which is necessarily accompanied by the mediatization (so is nowadays called the unprecented spreading of media systems and their interaction for any societal connections and autonomies), new differences are also produced as imitation of these patterns. Fragmentariness becomes established as a universal characteristic. The identity of senses and forms which are simultaneously spread by satellite communication channels over vast territories results in identifications of the specific and unique. For various reasons the local situation can noticeable correct the rules suggested by the civilization trunk-roads. It participates ditto noticeably in the triumph of the standard either inspired by high utility or by the interpretation of the world as the "only" and "single" place for all. The interaction between the global, local und superlocal is nonordinary and can not be explained alone in the terms of suppression and resistance how it can be often considered from the local standpoint of view.

We can not say that the biggest transnational media regulate the mass communication in Ukraine. CNN that does not recognize state borders is hardly accessible for Ukrainian audience. However, the main mechanisms of the global order, legitimated by the local situation, function quite efficiently [34]. As it is characteristic for the main part of the world the public model of communication is confidently forced out by the commercial model. And as it is characteristic for most of national mass media, domestic variations of the latter are proposed. From here let's proceed to the talk about "citizens" and "consumers".

Citizens and consumers

These identities do not necessarily need to define themselves in the horizon of the individual but in any way they manifest in his correlation with the public or private sphere of the living world. This conditions their ability to form statuses as collective values, interaction of which regulates the distances and connections between the every day life and civil society. The public and commercial media model, without considering solely their organizational-economic belongingness, may conventionally be considered as predominant orientation on this or that sphere. Selective analysis of the current state of affairs allows making a conclusion about the forming tendencies.

Any television viewer will notice the increasing commercialization of Ukrainian media. Content-analysis of the TV program published in the press attests a noticeable increase of TV programs of commercial type. From September 1996 the share of entertaining products in the general repertoire of broadcasting increased from one fifth to one third on the state-run TV (UT-1); from one third to a half on non-state national channels (1 + 1, UT-2, Inter); from a half to 70% on commercial channels such as Tonis and ICTV. The predominance of a commercial strategy, as can be easily understood, is characteristic only for the latter, while national television adheres to the priority of the public model or its equilibration with its commercial counterpart. So is the proclaimed strategy of television. Under consideration of the fact that not displayed in printed programs large advertising blocks open and close most telecasts, the factual model of national channels (with minor categoricity in the case of state-run television) will apparently turn out to be commercial. Such metamorphoses are of course directed at the consumer with care for his convenience since the attention of televiewers is the attention of advertisers after all.

The simple economy of media depends upon their mass character. According to its sense the commercial model is naturally oriented on mass culture. The most mass one is nowadays that which is spread by globalization mechanisms. The expressions "global media" and "global mass culture" are rather often used as synonyms decoded as "American popular culture" [35]. To put it simply, exactly the original or imitated American popular culture (with light-mindedness of its dialogue, social administration, violence, erotic and so on) is usually carried by globalization wave. Ukrainian television air is no exception of the rule. The high-rating studio "1 + 1" in the course of one week persistently offers Michel Douglas in the movies "The Pearl of the Nile", "The Roses'

War" and "Wall Street", the movie of Reger Aiver "Mr. Stitch" and "The Gun" by Robert Aultman, beginning its announcement with the words "for you". Americanization which seemed to be European myth is going on. The audience's reaction to it is, as in the whole non-American world, different. International researches on the perception of "Dallas" or "Dynasty" have in the first place ascertained divergence of judgments upon caused homogenization effects. In European countries the main part of televiewers considers American culture to be only one of the styles, in Brasilia, for example, people prefer to watch "home dramas" [36]. Most uncritical in the interpretation of television series are exactly the Americans; in contrast to them, Russian emigrants see in them the ideological basis and claims for domination [37]. That means that the message of American popular culture is not universal at all, vice versa, it is able to actualize local identities, and not only consumer orientations, to produce fragmentation of cultural commonnesses. In terms of control this would mean that the media use homogenous and heterogeneous mechanisms at the same time.

We can illustrate this with the example of advertising that substantially augments the commercial plots of American movies. As a result, this pattern of audiovisual game text receives the privilege of a standard, offered by television. However, it is perceived as such only by a part of Ukrainian audience that consists mainly of young people. In a society with increasing social differentiation advertising is, in addition, translator of various social senses. The main part of the impoverished public considers advertising as a surplus social message which is, however, not addresses to him and therefore causes irritation [38]. Standardization of the socio-cultural pattern turns into manifestation of social differences. It was also found out that advertising that is called to build the identity of the manufacturer actively produces reflection (being at least a symbolical pretext) upon socially important topics. It is not just coincidence that advertising reprises appear quite often in public oriented shows that suppose social and political criticism. It seems that the domestic ecological consumer will form earlier and more firmly than ecological consciousness of the population as we'd like to understand it.

On the other hand, programs and news rubrics which present the socially significant agenda offer the audience, for example, such symbolical world classifications which demonstrate the overt Ukrainian-centricity. According to figures of the comparative research on international news in 1995, approximately 70 % of international information of the media referred to the own state. Corresponding

indices of national media in Eastern and Central Europe were noticeable lower [39]. The point is not in what direction (besides strengthening of peripheral consciousness) does the image of a state, as independent subject of international affairs, exert influence upon the perception of global problems or formation of the citizenship identities of the audience. Effect is not calculated. Nevertheless, one cannot but mention the "map" of Baudrillard which "forestalls the territory" and refers to a reality-imitation.

The traditionally public branch of the politics, as it appears before Ukrainian televiewers, is also overburdened with the results of commercial strategy. The leaders in it begin to position themselves as trade marks and in the civil rhetoric people see the utilitarian idea of the population-electorate. Political advertising adopted by the media in the course of election campaign addresses both citizens and consumers. But what address achieves its object is unclear. Even if we add to the successes of Ukrainian television publicity and education all possible publicity products which are unintentionally produced by the commercial model of the media nowadays they remain in minority.

Strong media and "neglected" audience

The dominance of commercial media strategies is usually argued by their strong position. As any other, Ukrainian television is patiently suggesting the idea of presumption of its totality. "Television empire" or "Movie empire" (accessible exclusively through television) must attract by the scope of the reviewed. And that is not unfounded. The local situation that forms a radically changed socio-economic context works to the good of the global domination of television. In the competition for culture the media are practically beyond comparison.

The asymmetry between the involvement of population in the contacts with media and its participation in other traditional forms of culture exists in any modern society. In our case the distortion is intensified, for example, through drastic decrease of cinema visits (all-civilization traditions envisage the slower displacement of the cinema culture), minimization of contacts with the dramatic art in socio-cultural groups which used to go to the theatre before. Nowadays the television audience is practically equal to the adult population of the country, with exception of those 4-6 percents which do not have television sets. On the other hand, in 1997, 86% of the interviewed by the company Socis in a national sampling have not been in cinema at all, and those who

often, i.e. some times a year, went to the theatre or museums, made up 1 % each. Without considering the reasons we'd like just to draw attention to the striking inequality of chances.

The leadership of television in the media space increases the circulation of more general, "totally significant" plots of public peculiarity in comparison with those which can be offered by the press, orientated on the local concreteness. The newspaper culture has not its best times nowadays. As for the regular press readers, so according to the figures of the research mentioned above, in 1997 they made up 62%. Under consideration of the fact that the notion "regular" is nowadays reduced to some times a week the figures are striking.

As a rule, might foresees the patronage of those who are patronized – what is proclaimed by television in every possible way. Objectively, however, the audience as community of those who perceive and meditate can no longer be the main interest of the media which become firmly established among authorities and business circles. Continual reference of television presenters to the camera character of the happening in the studio is not only an advertising trick of the product but an expression of self-sufficiency.

The audience reacts to the demonstration of totality – in form of accessibility or variety and so forth – quite simply. In comparison with the earlier times it has distinctly differentiated its tastes and preferences. The neglectedness forms a certain branch of freedom in the sphere of consuming of cultural goods. While on the market of goods and services the freedom to keep to one's tastes often turns out to be only "potential", "imaginary" or "invented", in front of TV sets it is noticeably oftener realized "here" and "now". The choice what and when to watch can be quite categorical. The obvious criterion for preference in the television sphere is age as a combination of demographic, socio-status and cultural characteristics. Generalizing we may say that people under 40 prefer entertainment (global, or "American" variant of the present and, in case of fiction, the future as well), over 40 – Soviet classic and news. The model of "utilization and satisfaction" of media by the audience, suggested by Katz and Blumler, can explain much in this regard. The main subjects of communication have allegedly surmounted the dilemma of "weakness and strength". Both media and audience suggest their own models of consuming in mass communication.

Under conditions of unfavourable socio-economic situation it is hardly reasonably to consider the identity of citizens and consumers in the context of opposition. Both identities are important constituents of the living world. The question about the doubtful essence of the

spread pop culture is not solved though, however, it is obvious that the enlightening strategy of the media in the form it now has can not claim for an alternative and any success.

The commercial model of television segments the audience similar to the market. The researchers actively introduce into the social conceptualization of media the terms of marketing what is really effective if you study the audience-market. However, media studies by marketing are not the same as academic communication research and sociological research. The former move in the prospect of "the best consumer", the latter are oriented on civil climate and culture. The Ukrainian factualness speaks in favour of the utility and sufficiency of the former. But what is happening to the identities of the citizenship – we can learn from the latter.