

A Discussion of Cultural Studies and Contemporary Television

Emmanuelle Dias and Felipe Borges¹

Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, MG

Translated by Anneliese Hatton

University of Nottingham

Introduction

Among the contributions that Cultural Studies brings to the field of communication is the examination of reception as an integral part in the process of negotiation and resistance. In the specific context of television this perspective becomes even more important so that the role of the

¹ This article has been translated from a Portuguese conference proceeding, by permission of the original authors. The original paper is titled “Estudos Culturais e a televisão contemporânea em discussão” and was presented at XXXVIII Congresso Brasileiro de Ciências da Comunicação at Rio de Janeiro, 4–7 September 2015. It can be found online at https://www.academia.edu/18027669/Estudos_Culturais_e_a_televis%C3%A3o_contempor%C3%A2nea_em_discuss%C3%A3o.

audience in contemporary reconfiguration of the methods of the televisual experience can be understood.

Cultural Studies proposes textual analyses to understand to what extent, for example, television programmes can be understood and translated in different forms. Contemporary television has undergone profound transformations in terms of the apparatus on which they can be seen and in the very way that people relate to programmes. This has been happening in the midst of changes that involve questions of technology, economy and, the critical point here, of reception. Consequently, the televisual text itself has been reconfigured.

It is because of this that the contributions of authors such as Raymond Williams, Stuart Hall and Jesús Martín-Barbero, exponents of Cultural Studies, seem pertinent to considerations of contemporary television.² If culture is connected to a way of life and reception has an important role in the communication process, it seems opportune to observe how new methods of television consumption have brought changes in the television industry itself and in the ways televisual texts are produced and circulated.

This article will therefore discuss how phenomena like Netflix and on-demand services have been established as parts of a process of negotiation and dispute in the arena of televisual experience. Firstly, the article will outline the vision of culture and the way of watching television from the perspective of Cultural Studies. Next, a discussion of to what extent audience habits are related to a dynamic of reconfiguration in the television industry. Finally, an observation of how new television possibilities, linked to the internet, are relevant for reflection in this moment of disputes and negotiations and to understand culture as a whole.

² Although Williams and Hall belong to the British school of Cultural Studies, Martín-Barbero comes from Latin America. We know that these are different approaches, but we have an approximation between the studies of those authors that we considered pertinent.

The culture of Cultural Studies

Cultural Studies brings decisive contributions for thinking about the ways that culture, society and daily practices are intrinsically related and can be problematized by a means of communication – in this case, television. One of the most defining and forward thinking concepts in the field, and that is most of interest for this study, is from culture. According to Douglas Kellner:

The critical point (of cultural studies) is to subvert the distinction between higher and lower culture and this way, valorising cultural forms such as cinema, television and popular music, left behind by previous approaches, that tend to use literary theory to analyse cultural forms or to focalise, above all, or even at least, products of higher culture. (2001: 49)

The perspective that dominated until the advent of Cultural Studies was that culture had a “feeling that today we give to erudite culture and that refers to the quest and cultivation of moral, intellectual and spiritual perfection” (Gomes 2011, 31). Williams discusses the concept of culture that not only goes against the division between high and low culture, but also offers a new understanding of it (2011: 335).

Besides recognising the value of popular culture, created by the working classes and legitimate as an artistic manifestation, Williams understands that culture “(..) is not only a corpus of intellectual and imaginative work; it is also essentially a way of life”. Understood this way, culture is not only, for example, the films, discs, books and works of art produced by a society in a specific era. In the end, it is not a product, but a process. This means that daily practices and habits will shape this culture. In this way, more than thinking about clothing or manners of living as a way of life as Williams describes, it is important to understand that this concept is linked to alternative ideas of the nature of social relations (2011: 341). Itania Gomes explains:

Williams proceeds towards a radical transformation of the concept of culture and the possible ways to undertake cultural analysis; as a response to new political and social developments, culture articulates, at the same time, exterior elements, of structure, and elements of personal experience, private. (2011: 31)

Richard Hoggart proposes a similar concept in *The Uses of Culture* (1973), when he criticises how traditional cultural analysis erases the existence of simple man – which became central to his studies. By raising this for discussion, he could “see, beyond habits, what these habits represent, to see through declarations and and responses what these really mean (a meaning which could be the opposite of these very declarations)” (Hoggart 1973: 20).

From this concept of culture, Williams can escape from the dichotomy of base and superstructure, as dictated by Marxist tradition. His conception promotes a unification between the sphere of production (economy) and social relations (society and politics, for example). Not incidentally, “Williams is considered the founder of Cultural Studies for showing, in England in the 1950s, that material and cultural lives are profoundly interconnected and for showing the popular ballast of culture” (Gomes 2011: 31).

By examining culture through ordinary daily processes and paying attention to the forms of expression of popular culture, Cultural Studies provides a unique and valuable perspective on television. In the same way, by dedicating more attention to reception, it can bring to the surface uses and resignifications that come out of this process, and that become a rich source for analysis.

Ways of approaching television

For Williams, in *Television: technology and cultural form* (2003), television is the place where, at the same time, three important processes are interlinked: the technological, the institutional and the cultural. Specifically, the author deals with television as technology and cultural form from its socio-historical context; considering, in this way, television and the social sphere as inextricable agents.

From this perspective, Williams highlights that there are different ways of studying television. One of them is to study it through technology, from its historical development; or rather, as an invention, a technical apparatus that is associated to other technological innovations. The other way of studying television would be as a form of expression of culture (the study of the specificity of its discursive form in articulation with aspects of its materiality) (2003: 1-25).

According to Williams, society manifests determined impulses and practices that instigate the construction of changes (2003:12). Such impulses are named as ‘social needs’. For this discussion, Williams’ proposal that seeks to understand television as a technological means is fundamental, but also considering its history and socio-historical context. More than this, examining how social needs instigate the variety of uses that society makes of the television apparatus,³ and the new interactions that emerge from it, seem essential for the debate of televisual reconfigurations.

A long time ago, television ceased being a technological novelty. Familiarised with the presence of the electronic screen in our homes, we have learned, over the years, watching practices and we understand televisual language. According to Arlindo Machado (2000), there are various studies about television, and in many of them the notion of television remains that of a mere ‘service’, a system of diffusion or flow of programming. Such concepts are based, principally, in technological aspects, restricting studies to their means, thereby narrowing its reach.

According to Elton Antunes and Paulo Vaz (2006), “communication is not reduced to the means of communication or a transmitting function, but understands the constitution of discourses and the space of interlocution” (1-2). When the media is privileged as a ‘socio-technical apparatus’ it minimises the intervention of interlocutors, leaving aside the communicative process, just like the dynamic process of production itself and the construction of feelings. Therefore, the character of the insertion of the media in everyday experience is not taken into account, and neither the methods nor the means are reconfigured for social life.

³ When we speak of an apparatus we are not referring to a technological apparatus. We take as a basis the notion of media apparatus developed by authors such as Maurice Mouillaud (1997), Elton Antunes and Paulo Vaz (2006) and José Luiz Braga. This last author defines what he terms a “meeting of heterogeneous aspects that in some way articulate themselves in a determined social process [...] Some elements are technical, others cultural, others of the practical order, still others institutional; some will be essentially regarding communication” (2011:9).

Bringing such a reflection to light, it is possible to consider television as a place for the annotation of feelings, establishment of interactive and processual forms, and also as mediations, (re)interpretations of experiences. It is no accident that television plays an important role in the mediation of cultural and ideological values, through genres like soaps, series, films and news. Holder of its own identity, television is established as a 'personalised' look at the construction of mediated reality, regulating the visibility of the media and legitimising it as an instance of power. In a discourse on televisual practices and their mediations, Martín-Barbero (2006) characterises television as a cultural device that has its own forms, logic and connections, a place of visibility that ritualises manners of interpretation of the world, and socially accepted ways of 'watching'.

Once television is related to the manner of interpreting the world, it should not be seen or read from a single and definitive perspective. In this sense, multiple types of interpretation are involved, which raises questions about the viewers that act upon the content presented to them.

The televisual text: between readings and flows

By studying television, Stuart Hall proposes a model that embraces the idea of an active reception, re-signifying the codes in a process together with production. In the essay 'Encoding/Decoding' (2003), he analyses television programmes as open texts, which can be interpreted in various ways. In this schema, "coding is the definition of meaning inside a textual form, influenced by the practices of media professionals and decoding is the work done by the receptor to make sense of these texts" (Rocha 2011, 179). Simone Rocha adds:

Hall also suggested that there is a correlation between the social situations of people and the meanings they can interpret from a programme. He therefore postulated a possible tension between the structure of the text, which sustains the dominant ideology, and the social situations of the audience. Watching television becomes a process of negotiation between the spectator and the text. (2011: 179)

In this way, the feelings intended in the production are not necessarily those received by viewers,⁴ who will interpret the codes in their own way, based upon different factors.

This conception opens the prerogative that different readings of televisual texts are possible. In his theory of literature, Hall proposes that television programmes generally opt for an ensemble of feelings that work to maintain the dominant ideology, but that these feelings cannot be imposed, only preferred (Rocha 2011: 179). In the process of decodification, Hall defines three types of reading: that of the dominant, negotiated and opposition code (2003: 400-402). The first would be the reading in accordance with the hegemonic values presented by the text, or rather, when the viewer agrees with the views expressed there; the second would mix adaptation and opposition, once it recognises the legitimacy of the hegemonic definitions present in the text, but if negotiated these codes uphold the social group in which the subject inserts itself; and the third would be a case in which the reading goes against the feelings expressed in the text, in a way to deconstruct the hegemonic ideology. According to Hall:

“One of the most significant political moments (they also coincide with moments of crisis within television companies, for obvious reasons) is that in which the events that are normally signified and decodified in a negotiated way begin to have a non-conformist reading. Here is locked in the ‘the politics of meaning’; a fight in discourse.” (2003: 402)

It is important to note that Hall,⁵ by emphasising the different readings and a “fight” in the communication process, is also discussing resistance.

⁴ To refer to the televisual experience, we do not distinguish between the terms viewer(s), audience(s), and receptor(s). We know that the designations present important differences, but we do not propose to discuss these here.

⁵ In spite of being fundamental to advances in communication studies, the codification/decodification model presents some important problems, pointed out over time, such as: a structure that assimilates to linear models of communication; decodification as a unique act, that hides a set of deeper processes; the notion that preferential reading is necessarily in accordance with a dominant reading, as if media messages expressed a dominant ideology. This last problem was previously recognised by Hall himself (Porto, 2003).

If Critical Theory (Horkheimer 1980) indicates a relationship of absolute dominance regarding the media and the cultural industry, Cultural Studies makes use of the concept of hegemony (especially from a Gramscian perspective) to think about the relationships, in which there is a negotiation, and not a pure and simple submission. In the negotiation, a resistance often arises in front of the discourse presented in the text.

On the televisual text, Williams will observe how it will configure itself and in which way it offers modes of experience for the viewer. While discussing the act of watching television, he comments on the difficulty of describing it: “It would be like trying to describe the reading of two plays, three newspapers, three or four magazines, on the same day that you had been to a variety show, a lecture and a game of football” (2003: 96).

This experience lends itself to the heterogeneous and varied form that television configures itself, that Williams calls “flux”, an uninterrupted sequence of images from which television programmes are elaborated: “This phenomenon of programmed flux, is perhaps the definitive characteristic of broadcasting, simultaneously as a technology and as a cultural form” (Williams 2003: 86). In the middle of the flux, the viewer can access different types of “events” in their home and in a unique dimension and operation. These aspects reveal forms of the constitution of the televisual text and in what way the audience relates with them.

None of these dimensions, meanwhile, is stable in time. Currently, the number of new technologies is growing, and television lives in the moment of change in the growth of new protagonists in the media. A new behaviour in the public has been observed, with an ever increasing dispersal of audiences, who divide their time between the diverse possibilities of entertainment and information, like their own television, computers, video games, mobile phones, among others. As if this were not enough, the consumption of televisual content is no longer restricted only to the television set, but also through other means; principally, the internet.

Changes in the chain

Since the invention of the television, the diverse customs and habits of the viewer are remarkable regarding the interaction with the medium. At the beginning of the 20th century, the practice of watching television generally occurred in the living room with the relatives assembled. The television stations were just beginning to establish themselves, there were few programme options, and many of these were formerly from the radio. As part of the familiar quotidian, television was already appointed as a new technology of entertainment and leisure.

From the 1980s, the quantity of sets exploded on the market, and there has been a greater professionalization of televisual content and the offer of channels. The audience begins to fragment and the practice of watching television together became less common. Already by the 1990s, with the popularisation of mediums of entertainment like the VHS, games and the internet, the migration of viewers to more specialised content, oriented to specific niches, becomes frequent to the detriment of pre-determined and ample televisual programming. Material televisual support is no longer necessary, access to television content extends to other media like a computer, tablet and mobile phone.

In this way, the changes occurring in the customs of the viewer relate themselves in a dynamic way with technology; and with the television industry itself. Williams discusses how some words change in meaning throughout history, conforming to social changes. Among them is “industry”, which he points out has lost its pre-Industrial Revolution meaning, when it indicated a specific human attribute, to come to designate manufacturing and production industries and their activities (2011: 16). When it is used with a capital letter, “it is considered a proper thing, an institution, a body of activities, and not simply a human attribute” (16-17).

In daily life, we speak and hear about different “industries”: pharmaceutical, automobile, grocery, cosmetic, textile, among others. In fact, the notion we have approximates the writing by Williams. When we talk about the field of culture, we can say that industries position themselves, in the model proposed by Hall, in the spheres of production and the circulation of products – which does not mean to say that they are absolutely necessary in this sense, since, at the same time that

hegemony exists, there is also a process of negotiation. It is important to emphasise that, in this sense, that although “industry” delivers in the economic sense, it goes much further than this. The cultural industry itself, even in the conception of Critical Theory, treated art as a commodity, but as a means to impose values by means of a dominant discourse. Therefore, the symbolic dimension is essential.

It is interesting to reflect on the industry at the moment in which many are talking about a crisis in the cultural industry, represented, for example, by the phonographic, televisual and cinematographic industries. In a general way, all of them find themselves in a troubled period confronted by the options that the internet offers, by making available the products that sustain this industry in a free and unrestricted manner. The failure of the model of authorial rights has led to a collapse in the purchase of discs, DVDs and blu-rays, now that music, series and films are downloaded via the internet. Without doubt, it is a moment of transition, in which the industry is trying to find routes and solutions to be profitable.

In the specific case of the televisual industry, it is evident that these changes have been happening even in the core of what is understood as television. We can think about aspects like the programming and flux of Williams reconfiguring itself in contemporaneity. But why has this been happening?

Williams establishes that culture is an all-embracing term, capable of covering diverse relations, including with industry (2011, 19). At the same time, he presents culture as a way of life, which involves its own methods of leisure (apart from going much further than this, as we have already said). These methods of leisure have been changing according to the new televisual possibilities linked to the internet. In this way, not having access to a programme on an open or closed channel or even not being able to watch according to the schedule ceases to be a problem: having been solved by downloads, offering the same content on the internet, which has made a reconfiguration of the televisual industry necessary, because it has lost space to torrents and streamings on the internet.

It is in this context that platforms such as Netflix and even on demand services have come about, offered by channels like TV Globo and HBO.

Undoubtedly, they are configured as a response to advances on the internet, in an attempt to attract viewers back to where programmes are produced.

Aside from this, we can think about how the habits and preferences of a television audience helped to reconfigure the industry itself, in a dynamic process in which the reception is shown as active in another way, not only through multiple forms of interpretation of a televisual text. This way of living as a culture is linked to multiple factors, including the manner in which we deal with cultural products, the way we perceive them as easy to consume in the contemporary era, along with technological tools at our disposal.

New proposals

Over the years, it has become increasingly evident that the audience has migrated from the television screen to multiple digital platforms that offer television content at any time and place. Viewers have freed themselves from a fixed television platform and are able to consume their favourite programmes in the way best for them. Although a large part of the industry has tried (and is still trying) to fight against this process and paints the internet and viewers as villains, platforms like Netflix have resolved to embrace the cause and use the web not as an enemy, but an ally in an attempt to construct a new television proposal. This way, they have come to offer licensed content as well as their own in their streaming service, which can be accessed through the internet on any platform – Smart TV, tablet, mobile phone, notebook – attending to the demands of today’s television audience: personalised content, multiple and practical access, all at an affordable monthly rate. Apart from this, it was capable of attracting a part of the public that had not subscribed to downloads, either due to a lack of knowledge in how to download programmes, a lack of interest in engaging with the search for torrents or even opposition to a supposedly ‘illegal’ model. With Netflix, it is not necessary to search in order to download or to worry about piracy: it is enough to press play for the streaming of a programme to begin its legal reproduction.

Obviously, we cannot think about Netflix or even about similar proposals, like Amazon Prime Instant Video and Hulu, as distanced from

economic interests or even as proposals diametrically opposed to those of the old televisual industry. After all, its content is not free, profit is sought after incessantly and they are directly related to traditional television, seeing as they transmit its programmes that also make a profit in this process. However, proposals like Popcorn Time, despite being similar to the aforementioned examples, are negated and combatted against as illegal, seeing as they go almost completely against this model by offering all content in a free and unlicensed manner.

Nevertheless, what interests us is observing how social relations configure themselves in a much more dynamic way than a linear and absolute model can allow for. By observing media phenomena through the perspective of Cultural Studies, we can understand a dynamic process involving the industry and reception, in which there is, yes, hegemony, but a negotiated form that involves disputes of power and negotiation.

Television, in this way, has configured itself as an important agent in which the cultural practices of contemporary society are intertwined. If before habits consisted of watching televisual content offered by broadcasters in a familiar environment and joint reception, today we find individual and personalised consumption, at any time or place, that is not always associated with a broadcaster or channel. The practices constructed by audiences have obligated the televisual industry to reinvent itself, providing evidence of the resignification of hegemonic and counter-hegemonic notions of what can be considered 'television'.

Martín-Barbero (2006) in seeking to analyse communication from culture, values a fundamental notion for the study of reception: the concept of mediation. For the author, "the centre of the debate should be moved from the means to mediations; that is from articulations between communication practices and social movements, to different temporalities and the plurality of cultural matrices" (Martín-Barbero 2006, 258). Or rather, Martín-Barbero proposes a dislocation from an analysis of the means to the place where feelings emerge, to the scope of social uses, the "cultural mediations of communication" (2006:196).

You could think that different social groups possess different relations with television. All of these practices help in the very constitution of the way the televisual device is presented. After all, it is at the heart of the

everyday, from interactions between the audience, television and its content, that televisual reconfigurations are constructed.

Sharon Marie Ross (2008) (apud. Agostini 2010: 39) points out that the forms of participation of viewers in programme trends are confused with the very history of television, playing a part in the experience of watching television. Today, consumer habits have become visible not only in production, but also in the methods of circulation of televisual content. Aside from participation in the construction of programmes and the themes being explored, it seems to us that the audience has also influenced how it will consume televisual products. Televisual agency, in this way, has constituted itself in an immaterial way and with pulverisation of its content, without dependence on only one carrier. This has also influenced the very televisual flux that Williams (2003) discusses and how televisual products will be integrated.

However, just as Hall (2003) points out, it is worth remembering that the power is not totally on the side of receptive practices, given that the constructions and negotiations of feeling are also related to the processes of production, economy and the ways programmes are organised. In the same way, Martín-Barbero points out: “A large part of reception is in some way, not programmed, but conditioned, organised, touched, oriented through production, as much in economic terms as in aesthetic, narrative and semiotic terms” (1995: 56). In this way, social resignifications are in the modes of interaction with the means, between groups in society and the diverse agents that compose society.

Due to this, although it is remarkable that the practices of watching television have reconfigured the televisual format, we cannot fail to consider the manner in which the forms of production also contribute to the phenomenon. The availability of different episodes or contents at once, for example, have produced phenomena such as binge watching, catering for users who want to watch marathons of programmes. Taking into account this condition of reception, the production of some series, for example, has been based around more elaborate scripts, often without the use of cliffhangers. This aspect, as a sign, is one of the most interesting for understanding how the new forms of circulation and consumption of televisual texts leads to their own restructuring. Finally, previously series were shown with commercial intervals dividing

episodes into blocks. This led to the creation of narrative arcs that were conditioned by the minutes of each block, and that ended in a ‘miniclimax’ with the intention of retaining the audience until after the break. With the new method of circulation of programmes, streaming platforms and on demand services, this narrative strategy is no longer necessary, now that there are no commercial breaks; and because the viewer that chose to watch the determined series in this way did it in a decisive way, and not because they zapped through television channels.

This way, the process of negotiation involved in the consumption of television today influences a textual reconfiguration. This is one of the dimensions that operates in the establishment of the rules of:

“[...] a type of grammar of forms of expression of the televisual, that, although in permanent construction, structures the narratives, informs televisual texts, importing to them their own characteristics, that distinguish them from audio-visual texts aired through other mediums.”
(Duarte 2012: 325)

In this way, through multiple dimensions that operate together, what seems to be happening is yet another reorganisation of the very grammar of the televisual text.

Therefore, we observe not only an intense negotiation between the new practices utilised by the audience and the constitution of the televisual device, but also the insertion of new technologies and processes that influence the circulation and production of the content of television. All of these aspects together reconfigure the televisual experience as a whole.

Conclusion

Hall (2003) defends the notion that television programmes are relatively open texts, capable of being read in various ways by different people. Thus, the practice of watching television is seen as a process of negotiation between viewer and text; a type of discursive conflict.

It is reasonable to think that the reflections we have made throughout this article propose a negotiation that goes beyond the text, and are therefore also related to the televisual device. We have discussed not only negotiated readings of the televisual text, but also of practices related to

various ways of consuming television. If watching television is a process of negotiation between viewer and text, we would say that this relationship can be applied to the device as well. Perhaps it would be pertinent to discuss, faced with the current phenomenon, a conflict between the device and the various forms of circulation of this discourse. It becomes interesting to think about how the hegemonic codes remain, negotiated and in opposition in this context, that involves new proposals such as Netflix and Popcorn Time.

In this way, it is also interesting to understand how the forms of circulation and consumption influence their own configuration of televisual grammar. This shows to what extent these instances are related, and how form and content cannot be taken in a separate manner, seeing that they present a dynamic relationship. The forms of circulation and consumption end up influencing, in a decisive way, the televisual text; that does not lose its singularity when faced with other mediums in this process. Thus, it becomes necessary to reflect upon what becomes of the 'flux' discussed by Williams, when faced with the new television presented here.

In *Culture and Society*, Williams outlines how modifications in life and thought correspond to alterations in language through the analysis of literary productions from the end of the eighteenth century until the middle of the twentieth century. For the author, it was possible to observe how determined words acquired new meanings or to what extent new words emerged in English vocabulary as a way of giving account to the changes that were occurring in the life of that society. In synthesis, Williams discusses how language changes according to modifications in the social environment; the significance of words alters in this process. We can say, in light of these discussions that the understanding of the term 'television' has changed, over time, when examining the transformations that occur continuously. Television is, definitively, no longer the same.

WORKS CITED

- Agostini, Adriana. *Elas por elas: e o universo lésbico se faz presente na TV*. Dissertação (Mestrado em Programa de Pós-Graduação em Comunicação) - Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, 2010.
- Braga, José Luiz. 'Dispositivos interacionais'. In: *XX Encontro Anual da Compós*, Porto Alegre (RS). Anais..., 2011.
- Antunes, Elton; Vaz, Paulo B. 'Mídia: um aro, um halo e um elo'. In: Guimarães, César; França, Vera (orgs). *Na mídia, na rua - narrativas do cotidiano*. Belo Horizonte: Autêntica, 43–60, 2006.
- Duarte, Elizabeth Bastos. 'Televisão: Novas modalidades de contar as narrativas'. In: *Contemporanea: Comunicação e Cultura* 10.2. 324-339, 2012.
- Gomes, Itania M.M. 'Raymond Williams e a hipótese cultural da estrutura de sentimento'. In: Itania Maria Mota Gomes; Jeder Janotti Jr.. (Org.). *Comunicação e Estudos Culturais*. 1st ed. Salvador: EDUFBA_Editora da Universidade Federal da Bahia, 2011, vol. 1, 29–48.
- Hall, Stuart. *Da Diáspora: identidades e mediações culturais*. Belo Horizonte:Ed. UFMG, 2003.
- Hoggart, Richard. *As utilizações da cultura: aspectos da vida da classe trabalhadora, com especiais referências a publicações e divertimentos*. Lisboa: Editorial Presença, 1973.
- Horkheimer, Max. *Teoria Tradicional e Teoria Crítica*. Os Pensadores. São Paulo, Abril Cultural, 1980.
- Kellner, Douglas. *A cultura da mídia—estudos culturais: identidade e política entre o moderno e o pós-moderno*. Trans. de Ivone Castilho. São Paulo: EDUSC, 2001.
- Machado, Arlindo. *A Televisão Levada a Sério*. 1st ed. São Paulo: Editora do Senac, 2000.
- Martín-Barbero, Jesús. 'América Latina e os anos recentes: o estudo da recepção em comunicação social'. In: SOUSA, Mauro Wilton (org.). *Sujeito, o lado oculto do receptor*. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1995.

———. *Dos meios às mediações: comunicação, cultura e hegemonia*. 4th ed. Rio de Janeiro: UFRJ, 2006, p.196.

Mouillaud, Maurice. *Da forma ao sentido*. In: Mouillaud, Maurice; Porto, Sérgio D. (orgs). 'O jornal – da forma ao sentido'. Brasília: *Paralelo 15*, 1997.

Porto, Mauro P. 'A pesquisa sobre a recepção e os efeitos da mídia: propondo um enfoque integrado'. XXVI Congresso Brasileiro de Ciências da Comunicação. INTERCOM, Belo Horizonte, MG. Anais... 2-6, Sep. 2003.

Rocha, Simone Maria. 'A Análise cultural da televisão'. In: Gomes, Itania Maria Mota; Janotti Jr., Jeder. (Org.). *Comunicação e Estudos Culturais*. Salvador: EDUFBA, 2011, 177-194.

Williams, Raymond. *Television: technology and cultural form*. Londres: Routledge, 2003.

———. *Cultura e sociedade*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2011.