

program development (Mody 1987). Nevertheless, some *effects* materialized. Children exposed to TV in the classroom showed significant gains in language development; programs led to enquiries for more knowledge, as measured by the greater utilization of libraries in schools, and the adult education evening transmissions resulted in statistically significant gains in the knowledge of preventive health.

In the 1980s, US foreign aid (USAID) and the then satellite cooperative INTELSAT conducted educational demonstrations of satellite capability. INTELSAT enabled the Chinese Open University to experiment with one-way video and audio applications; Ireland and Jordan to exchange university courses; and hospitals in Latin America and Miami, and Uganda, Kenya, and Canada, to do telemedicine.

Until the 1980s, TV was owned and operated in Asia, Africa, and the Caribbean by the state. TV in Latin America had fallen under US commercial influence after its independence from European colonizers. The few applications of television for development were expensive and state-financed, and hence constituted additional demands on already overstretched state budgets. As developing countries struggled with their economy, the US, western Europe, and Japan pushed them to open up national firms (including state broadcasting monopolies) to *private and foreign investment*. Simultaneously, domestic lobbies were advocating the US model of advertising-based radio and TV ownership so coverage could expand beyond the capital city.

The instructional design model of the 1960s and 1970s for specific educational audiences, which was so expensive to implement and was infrequently used outside short-lived, aid-financed projects, has given way to another educational model initiated by foreign aid that is more suited to the large-audience needs of an advertiser-financed media system. Entertainment education has actually been credited with helping the state broadcaster to move from state public service ownership to a commercially competitive operator in India. Television for development in the early twenty-first century is promoting *modernization via the marketplace*. Audience-specific educational media interventions are limited to community radio initiatives, where they exist.

See also: ► BBC WORLD SERVICE ► DEVELOPMENT COMMUNICATION ► EDUCATIONAL COMMUNICATION ► INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION ► MEDIA EFFECTS ► RADIO FOR DEVELOPMENT ► SATELLITE TELEVISION ► UNESCO

REFERENCES AND SUGGESTED READINGS

- Engel, F. & Wilkins, K. (eds.) (2012). Communication, media and development: Problems and perspectives. *Nordicom*. Special Issue. Vol. 31.
- Hornik, R. C. (1988). *Development communication: Information, agriculture and nutrition in the third world*. New York: Longman.
- McAnany, E. (2012). *Saving the world: A brief history of communication for development and social change*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Mody, B. (1987). Contextual analysis of the adoption of a communication technology: The case of satellites in India. *Telematics and Informatics*, 4(2), 151–158.
- Singhal, A. (ed.) (2004). *Entertainment, education and social change*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Wilkins, K., Tufte, T., & Obregon, R. (eds.) (2014). *Handbook of development communication and social change*. Oxford: Wiley Blackwell.

Television as Popular Culture

TOBY MILLER

University of Cardiff/Murdoch

‘Television’ describes a physical device, a cultural system, and a labor process that brings the two together and embeds them in the daily experience of half the world’s population. ‘Popular’ signifies of, by, and for the people, offering transcendence through pleasure (→ Popular Communication). ‘Culture’ signifies everyday customs and tastes (→ Culture: Definitions and Concepts). In the humanities, popular television texts are evaluated by criteria of quality and politics, understood through criticism and history. The social sciences focus on television viewers ethnographically, experimentally, and statistically. ‘Popular culture’ relates to markets. Neo-classical economics assumes that expressions of the desire and capacity to pay for services animate entertainment and hence determine what is ‘popular.’

People had long fantasized about transmitting images and sounds. TV has its own patron saint, Clare of Assisi, a teen runaway from the thirteenth century who was canonized in 1958 for imagining a midnight mass broadcast on her wall. In 1935, Rudolf Arnheim predicted that television would bring global peace, but also warned that “television is a new, hard test of our wisdom.” The emergent medium’s easy access to knowledge would either enrich or impoverish its viewers, manufacturing an informed public, vibrant and active – or an indolent audience, domesticated and passive (Arnheim 1969, 160–163; → Television: Social History).

Ever since the Industrial Revolution, anxieties have existed about urbanized populations vulnerable to manipulation by images and demagogues through the popular. This is spectacularly the case with television. The notion of the suddenly enfranchised being bamboozled by the unscrupulously fluent has recurred throughout the modern period. It leads to an emphasis on the number and conduct of television audiences: where they came from, how many there were, and what they did after being there. These audiences are conceived as empirically knowable, via research instruments derived from sociology, demography, psychology, communications, and marketing. Such concerns are coupled with a concentration on content. Texts are also conceived as empirically knowable, via research instruments derived from communications, sociology, psychology, and literary criticism.

TV has given rise to three *key topics in research*: (1) ownership and control, (2) texts, and (3) audiences, with the question of the audience, and the knowledge that it has or that it lacks, as the governing discourse. Approaches to *ownership and control* vary between neo-liberal endorsements of limited regulation by the state, in the interests of guaranteeing market entry for new competitors, and Marxist critiques of the bourgeois media’s control of the agenda for discussing society. Approaches to *textuality* either unearth the meaning of individual programs and link them to broader social formations and problems or establish patterns across significant numbers of similar texts (→ Text and Intertextuality). Approaches to *audiences* vary between social-psychological attempts to validate correlations between watching TV and social conduct, and culturalist critiques of imported television threatening national

culture (→ Audience Research; Exposure to Television).

There are several *models of the impact of television* on popular culture. Most reception studies assume that audience members risk abjuring either interpersonal responsibility (in the US) or national culture (in the rest of the world). The *domestic effects model* (DEM), dominant in the US and increasingly exported around the world, is typically applied without consideration of place and is psychological. Entering young minds hypodermically, TV can both enable and imperil learning and drive viewers to violence (→ Violence as Media Content, Effects of).

The other key formation is a *global effects model* (GEM), primarily utilized in non-US discourse. Whereas the DEM focuses on individual human subjects, via observation and experimentation, the GEM looks to customs and patriotism (→ Globalization Theories). Instead of measuring audience responses to TV electronically or behaviorally, the GEM interrogates the geopolitical origin of televisual texts and the themes and styles they embody.

A third tendency endorses *the audience as active rather than passive*: consumers who use TV like an appliance, choosing what they want from its programming, and interpreters who use it to bring pleasure and sense to their lives. The television audience supposedly makes its own → meanings, outwitting institutions of the state, academia, and capital that seek to measure and control it (→ Uses and Gratifications).

See also: ► AUDIENCE RESEARCH ► CULTURE: DEFINITIONS AND CONCEPTS ► EXPOSURE TO TELEVISION ► GLOBALIZATION THEORIES ► MEANING ► MEDIA ECONOMICS ► MEDIA EFFECTS ► MEDIA HISTORY ► POPULAR COMMUNICATION ► TELEVISION: SOCIAL HISTORY ► TEXT AND INTERTEXTUALITY ► USES AND GRATIFICATIONS ► VIOLENCE AS MEDIA CONTENT, EFFECTS OF

REFERENCES AND SUGGESTED READINGS

- Arnheim, R. (1969). *Film as art*. London: Faber and Faber.
 Miller, T. (2010). *Television: The basics*. London: Routledge.