

Reviving Cultivation Theory for Social Media

Raziye Nevzat, Eastern Mediterranean University, Cyprus

The Asian Conference on Media, Communication & Film 2018
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

George Gerbner's Cultivation Theory examines the effect of TV on the audience. A similar synthetic world appears to exist on Facebook according to the facts of cultivation theory. Whatever is shared on social media platforms forms an opinion and might end up with a judgment. One of the biggest parts of cultivation theory is resonance which focuses on creating pseudo-realities parallel with everyday life. Social media platforms enable people to create a profile where they can appear as they want to be, talk like they want to. Thus this profile is somehow their avatar. Thinking that billions of people are showing the same behavior, it is clear that a “synthetic content” is also present in social media platforms. For this reason, in this current social media era, it is a necessity to improve cultivation theory and make it applicable to today’s social media world. Along with four eras of communication theory, this paper discusses the necessity of reviving and adjusting cultivation theory to social media for reading user behavior more efficiently.

Keywords: Cultivation Theory, Social Media, Social World, Alternative Reality

iafor

The International Academic Forum

www.iafor.org

Introduction

The revolutionary entrance of the internet changed communication paradigms fundamentally. People spend considerable time on the internet and their perception of the world is shaped by what they see on the internet. This rapid change has created network communities (Bayraktar & Amca, 2012) and network communities have replaced the TV audience as media consumers long time ago. Gerbner's Cultivation theory was a breakthrough in media studies; studying television's construction of a worldview to viewers. Gerbner's focus was on measuring the effects of TV exposure with institutional analysis, message system analysis and cultivation analysis. While institutional and message system analysis were mainly concerned with messages directed at the masses and the meanings derived from these messages, cultivation analysis dwelled on TV's long-term construction of an "assumption about life and the world" (Gerbner, 1973, p. 567). Abundant research is present whether a TV audience cultivates a reality parallel to what they see on television on specific terms such as the cultivation of gender roles (Saito, 2007); acculturation through talk show programs (Woo & Dominick, 2001), the cultivation on local news (Weitzer & Kubrin, 2004; Gross & Aday, 2003) and many other genre-specific programs. The new media enable the audience to be active participants of, and contributors to media and this interactivity creates reciprocity between the media producer, distributor and the consumer. The genre specific content has shifted to be present on social media networking sites (SNS) for the audience to be read and shared; however, the above-mentioned content consumption by the media consumer and the worldview that is constructed through the cultivation of the media content has not thoroughly been investigated by scholars. The new media has only been related to cultivation theory recently yet the focus on the relationship is still not the capability of social media constructing a worldview. Cultivation theory is still argued within TV framework and recently a study revealed cultivation theory is still to be thought with new media but mainly because new media made broadcasting more convenient. (Morgan, Shanahan & Signorielli, 2015).

Gross (2009), a scholar who contributed to the creation of cultivation theory, declared that before the Internet, TV was a story teller. However, what TV did back then in terms of constructing assumptions, is implemented by the Internet social networks and on-demand media consumption. In order to look at how the Internet inhabits our world, it is a must to scrutinize social networks as a collaborator of generating a parallel worldview of one's own reality since the role of social media is beyond uploading individual pictures and information on the internet.

This study focuses on how the social construction of a reality occurs on social media networking sites that reinterprets Gerbner's cultivation theory in an evolved platform. The study revises four eras of communication theory (Baran & Davis, 2012) and looks at their possible connection with social media. It examines why cultivation theory, as an opinion forming theory needs to be revived to study social media. As Gross (2009) suggests, in contemporary media studies *re-asking* and *reassessing* communication methods should be a priority due to the changing nature of communication technologies.

Four Eras of Communication Theory applied online

Stanley J. Baran & Dennis K. Davis, in their book, *Mass Communication Theory*, review communication theories in four eras. Authors reiterate that social orders and cultures around the world are changing due to the impact of the Internet to communication. Communication technology offers various forms of media systems and is enthusiastically accepted by many people (Baran&Davis, 2012, p. 23).

As stated by the authors, Baran and Davis' work on the recollection of mass communication theories in four eras provides a conceptual model of communication and role of media as well as the emerging effects of the communication technology. The influence of media and new media technology leads to social change. One ultimate aim is to look at how this social change has occurred in different times and social orders. Following Baran and Davis, this section briefly informs these changes in four different eras and questions how the social construct of reality is reshaped within and by social media consumption.

Mass society and Mass Culture Theory

Mass society theory is mainly based on industrial society. Baran and Davis explains this theory as an ideology "... *rooted in nostalgia for a golden age of rural community life that never existed... it anticipates a nightmare future where we all lose our individuality and become servants to the machines*" (Baran&Davis, 2012, p. 27). One theory which made a contribution to the mass society and mass culture theory is that of Tonnies and Durkheim. Tonnies' social community (1988) concepts for *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* define two different types of society types. *Gemeinschaft* refers to the collective aspect of society whereas *Gesellschaft* is used to define a more individualistic and modern society. Emile Durkheim went further to define society types. He made a distinction between organic solidarity and mechanic solidarity. The former refers to folk cultures bound by traditional roles whereas the latter focuses on social orders bound by social ties. (Baran&Davis, 2012, p. 66). According to mass media theory, media has a direct and often negative effect on people (Baran&Davis, 2012, p. 55). The mass media theory is often criticized within the framework of the penny press and yellow journalism of the 1800s. This type of journalism is often associated with low quality and basic content. The same criticism is often cast on many today's social media, for its tendency towards trivialism, sensationalism and rapid dissemination of unverified news.

McQuail stated that mass media has a role "*in shaping the individual and collective consciousness by organizing and circulating the knowledge which people have their own everyday life and of the more remote contexts of their lives*" (McQuail, 1972, p. 13) The type of knowledge presented by the media paves the way to a social construction of reality. Adoni and May reveal that "*The social construction of reality is a dialectical process in which human beings act both as the creators and as products of their world*" (1982, p. 325). Authors also state that the media content may form a symbolic social reality. Televised news provides a "distorted objective reality" as well as the portrayal of biased social groups and social strata (Glasgow University Media Group, 1976, 1980 as quoted in Adoni & May, 1984)

Baran and Davis make a crucial claim that mass society theory is not yet focused on the Internet, considering the characteristics of negative influence of the media that mass society theory undertakes. The vital point made by Baran and Davis is that in today's society, large likeminded communities are no longer built in cities or urban areas, but in media environments online. This; provides a crucial background to the aforementioned social strata, distorted objective reality, and biased interpretation of news, almost exclusively surrounded by likeminded individuals on today's social media communities. According to the Global Web Index Report (2018), people spend an average of six hours online. As social media consumption continues to increase, so does its ability to reinforce a reality or social order. Gamson *et al* (1992) reiterate that images (articles, ideas) consumed by consumers in mass media, lead to meaning construction. This will be discussed further in the 'meaning making theories' section of this paper.

The Limited-Effect Theory

The limited effect theory, developed by Paul Lazarsfeld in the 1940's and 1950's is a theory which dwells on the idea that media are not as powerful as they once believed they are. Unlike mass society theorists, Lazarsfeld suggested that media do not strictly have a negative effect on communities but rather stimulates trends and are not a disruptive force (Baran&Davis, 2012, p. 30). Lazarsfeld made empirical social research in order to prove these points and took family, friends and communities as competing factors when analyzing media and concluded that individuals' search for media messages are in parallel with their own thought system and opinions.

Joseph T. Klapper (1960) studied Limited Effect Theory further and brought *selective exposure*, *selective perception* and *selective retention* notions together. For Klapper, people will select opinions that would support their own, perceive these messages and process them according to their own ideas. They only tend to remember the messages that support their own. The selective perception process is very relevant to social media consumption, as people prefer to join groups fitting their pre-existing ideology or interests. Moreover people tend to, unfollow and block the messages (people and sources) which they find disagreeable or do not interest them. Increasingly people tend to (almost) exclusively consume, create, comment or interact with likeminded media, communities or individuals.

Throughout his research Lazarsfeld also came up with **two-step flow theory** which dwells on the "idea that messages pass from media, through opinion leaders, to opinion followers" (Baran&Davis, 2012, p. 145) Lazarsfeld constructed a hierarchical order from gatekeepers to opinion followers who anticipate an opinion or advice. Media effects go through a filtering process through friends and social groups (Baran & Davis, 2012, p. 148). Limited Effect Theory focuses on the fact that media effects are not necessarily negative as societal groups may prevent negative effects and reinforce positive ones. Collins (2016) criticizes how media imagery and media effects may generally encourage passive citizenship and cynicism. However, media *messages* may form a multi-voiced discourse, especially for social movements to offer "competing constructions of reality" (Gamson *et al*, 1992, p. 391). The effect of social media in social movements was abundantly explicit in the 2010 'Arab Spring' and the recent 'Occupy movement'. However, the question of whether the role of social media on online social movements is objective remains unresolved.

Cultural studies theories and cultural perspectives

After the Limited Effect theory, a new perspective was raised that took social theories into consideration to explain the relationship between media and culture. The Neo-Marxist theories based their arguments on Karl Marx's ideology. They argued that the problems associated with hierarchy and industrialization led to the exploitation of workers in order to fulfill elite interests. It paved the way to cultural studies theories. (Baran & Davis, 2012, p. 217)

One of the foundations of the Neo-Marxist theories of cultural studies evolved in the Frankfurt School focusing mainly on the culture industry. Horkheimer and Adorno led the way in criticizing mass media and the commodification of high and folk culture. The Neo-Marxists also founded a school called British Cultural studies in the 1960's. This school studied how powerful and dominant groups, used media in order to strengthen their ideas (Baran & Davis, 2012, p. 34). The school studied how media content could be interpreted as either misleading or constructive.

During the same time period, Marshall McLuhan was looking at the impact of electronic media on both culture and society. McLuhan questioned how different forms of culture were constructed through the changing paradigms and thought systems that were structured by technology. For Baran and Davis "McLuhan was a technological determinist" (Baran&Davis, 2012, pp. 229-230). McLuhan was best known for introducing "*The Medium is the message*" and the "*Global Village*" terminologies, in which he claimed that electronic media, and its ability to distribute messages to many people at the same time, the world, and evolve it into a big global village.

Harold Innis however, still believed in the bias of communication and how communication technology revolves around power. On an optimistic level, social media have fulfilled some of McLuhan's prediction. As a system it certainly has the capability to bring people together from all over the world. Whether the technology is capable of creating a truly global village remains to be seen.

Easy information and communication systems have shaped and informed society. Information and media have been democratized but have also been individualized. This society is structured and even jumbled by the easy information systems which they enrolled in. Christian Fuchs, in his book, *Internet and Society: Social theory in the information age*, lists the characteristics of today's dynamic modern society and claims that it is shaped by the opposites such as "self-determinism and heteronomy," "cooperation and competition," "exclusion and inclusion" (Fuchs, 2008, p. 58). The characterization of Fuchs is crucial as it portrays today's Internet user and how his/her social reality is constructed; self-determinist in accessing information s/he needs, but heteronomous to big corporates providing that information; in competition with keeping his/her privacy, but cooperative when asked to share personal information to open a profile; inclusive and participatory to world matters, a citizen journalist, but exclusive when it comes to criticizing the exploitation of the masses in communication technologies.

Meaning Making Theories

The era we live in is defined as the meaning making perspective era by many researchers and focuses on how we interpret the media and its symbols. The meaning making theories are very much different from mass society and limited effect theories, because they see the audience as passive where the latter see the audience as active.

The meaning making era is believed to commence in the early 1920's, with Robert Park's work on connecting communities for news dissemination and Alfred Schultz' introduction of phenomenology to scrutinize individual human experiences for structuring a better communication methods. Theories such as Symbolic Interactionism by Herbert Blumer and George Herbert Mead; added a value to interactive communication and meaning making theories by discussing how symbols shape the human learning process and behavior.

Coming to the 1990's and 2000's, the current era of technology was also of interest to many. It was at this time active audience theories and uses-and-gratifications theory emerged. The former focuses on evaluation of what people do with media whereas the latter by H. Herzog (1941) mainly evaluates why and how people use media. These theories assist scholars to interpret digital conversations, redefining the active role of the audience as well the impact.

With almost 2.2 Billion users, Facebook is believed to be one of the most influential of social media platforms, providing various tools for communication community building, distribution and content to the user. The content is both visual and conversational and contribute to the meaning making paradigm by covering and sharing endless amount of symbols such as logos, profile pictures and brand representations. The Symbolic Interactionism theory transformed itself to Hyper-Symbolic Interactionism to discuss how we make meaning from the digital symbols and socialize digitally (Lynch & McConatha, 2006)

A shift to meaning making in social media? Can we revive cultivation theory for social media?

The rationale of why cultivation theory was revolutionary in the meaning making era is due to the magical entrance of television into people's lives. Cultivation theory was first introduced by George Gerbner in the 1960's and is said to be one of the most studied theories by scholars. (Potter, 2014, Morgan & Shanahan, 2010)

Gerbner's theory examines how television actively contributed to the perception of social reality by audience/viewer. Gerbner investigates how the perception of reality by individuals was influenced by television. Gerbner defines cultivation analysis as the "*study of the relationships between institutional processes, message systems, and the public assumptions, images and policies that they cultivate*" (Gerbner, 1970, p. 71)

Cultivation analysis reiterates that the message system that is derived from the television, produced a worldview that would later become a reality and distorts people's judgment. George Gerbner assessed this distortion and the implementation of the worldview through violation index and cultural indicators projects. The Violation

index simply consisted of analyzing the content as to "... how much violence was actually present in annual prime time programming" (2012, p. 341). His study was majorly criticized by researchers due to the limited definition of the content; in order to prove his point, Gerbner continued with the Cultural Indicator's project, an experiment in which he looked closely at how television is the "creator of synthetic patterns," (Gerbner, 1978 as cited in Baran & Davis, 2012, p. 341) Gerbner, explains this as:

"The substance of the consciousness cultivated by TV is not so much specific attitudes and opinions as more basic assumptions about the facts of life and standards of judgment on which conclusions are based" (Gerbner and Gross, 1976, p.175, as cited in Baran & Davis, 2012, p. 342).

Similarly, Glynn *et al* (2007) studied the effects on talk show programs and revealed that viewers who watched programs like 'The Oprah Winfrey Show' were more likely to support activist government policies than the viewers of a different genre. The aforementioned synthetic pattern becomes the world of the television viewer in Gerbner's theoretical framework. Morgan & Shannan (2010) summarized various studies that focused on light, medium and heavy viewers as well as program exposure relationship and concluded that "viewers with specific preferences will seek out programs that nourish and sustain the worldviews that such viewers find plausible" (p. 341). One major example authors provide as an example to support this study is Kubic & Chory's (2007) work on the negative correlation between makeover programs and self-esteem. Social media is heavily criticized for bombarding perfect, photoshopped, filtered and impeccable body images similar to makeover and aesthetic surgery programs do on television.

Gerbner's study on the state of cultivation was based on 98% of televisions in American homes (Baran & Davis, 2012, p. 342). A similar major population is now actively consuming and contributing on many social media platforms, mainly on Facebook with approximately 2.2 billion members¹. The company page informs that informs that 84% of Facebook users are from outside the USA which escalates the effect of the platforms²; only difference being that; it is no longer the TV screen that cultivate a particular worldview, rather than mobile phones and computer screens.

Media consumption and production has rapidly increased in an era where *Netizens* (Hauben & Hauben, 1995) considered crucial to not only have access to news, programs and platforms, but also to social communities, friends, opinions and ideas.

"People born after 1990 do use media much more often than those born earlier. Media have become an integral part of their daily lives. The average eight- to eighteen year-old uses media for seven and a half hours each day" (Baran & Davis, 2012, p. 314).

From this perspective, it is a fact that social media have already replaced TV in the *netizens'* world. Due to this reason, social media should be included in meaning

¹ Facebook Statistics, 2018. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/264810/number-of-monthly-active-facebook-users-worldwide/>

² <http://newsroom.fb.com/company-info/>

making paradigms in order to develop theories on how they provide a worldview and constructs a social reality for masses.

TV has provided many media messages and everyday realities but the synthetic reality that is constructed through mainstream news, real-life stories, story making, character representation and media images have largely shifted online. Facebook, Instagram, Snapchat, Twitter & Youtube as the leading social media platforms, shape people's worldviews in a way that whatever is seen online is perceived to be "real". Gerbner's theoretical pattern of cultivation theory that proposes the worldview based on assumptions, continues with a conclusion and ends with the judgment process that is identical with the users' state on social media. On these platforms, people are ready to share whatever they like, encourage or believe. Whatever is shared on social media platforms contributes to building an opinion and might end up with a judgment. The acts of commenting, liking, following, subscribing and sharing can be easily identified as opinion forming acts and these acts convey a message that the user has reached a conclusion followed by a judgment.

Social media platforms enable people to create a profile where they can appear in the way they would like to be, and talk like they would want talk. As such this profile becomes somehow their sanitized and idealized avatar. It is possible to propose that a similar synthetic content is present on social media that enable millions of users to engage in the same activity or engage in using content that is congruent to their everyday reality. To relate cultivation theory to today's social media user habits is therefore crucial as it will contribute to read the user behavior of social media efficiently. Gerbner was very careful in explaining cultivation theory as a critical theory and not labeling it as "powerful effects of TV (Baran&Davis 2012, p. 346) and James Shannan and Vicky Jones contributes to this as such:

"Cultivation is sometimes taken as a return to a strong "powerful effects" view of mass media. This view isn't completely incorrect, but it misses the point that cultivation was originally conceived as a critical theory, which happens to address media issues precisely and only because the mass media (especially television) serve the function of storytelling.... Television is the dominant medium for distributing messages from cultural, social and economic elites.... Cultivation is more than just an analysis of effects from a specific medium; it is an analysis of the institution of television and its social role. (Shanahan & Jones 1999, as cited in Baran & Davis, 2012, p. 346)

The need to construct a critical theory on social media could help scholars to study the institutional analysis just like Gerbner did with TV. An institutional analysis was constructed on TV as a dominant power rather than a channel; a similar approach should be considered on social media; not as a means of channel or a medium but as an institution, implementing a social role. Recently, a lot of debate is going on about how social media is affecting people's perceptions of reality. Regarding the social construction of reality, Gamson *et al* (1992) reiterate that:

"We walk around with media-generated images of the world, using them to construct meaning about political and social issues. The lens through which we receive these images is not neutral but evinces the power and point of view of the political and economic elites who operate and focus it. And the special genius of this system is to

make the whole process seem so normal and natural that the very art of social construction is invisible.” (p. 373)

On social media, users often present a “perfect image”, “perfect holiday”, “perfect relationship”, “perfect life”, distort everyday life and the average, less than perfect habits of the audience they share it with. Here; the state of cultivation differs significantly from TV. For Gerbner TV creates a worldview in parallel to everyday reality, but in social media however, its users mutually make an effort to project a near perfect, idealised image, often different from their everyday reality.

For Gerbner, 3 B’s of Television identify the effects on people. According to Gerbner as quoted in Baran & Davis:

1. Television **blurs** traditional distinctions of people’s views of their world.
2. Television **blends** their realities into television’s cultural mainstream.
3. Television **bends** that mainstream to the institutional interests of television and its sponsors.” (Baran& Davis, 2012, p. 346)

If we were to apply this to social media, the effects would probably be as such:

1. Social media **blurs** imperfection and portrays the issues and people as perfect
2. Social media **blends the** lives of people with their avatars and both realities are blended on a social profile
3. Social media **bends** the mainstream realities to the institutional interest of big corporates of social media.

Out of all these facts, the institutional interest of social media platforms and advertising partners is crucial. Cambridge Analytica incident was an example to question whether social media was capable of bending the mainstream reality via advertising partners. In early 2018, the Cambridge Analytica company was accused of misusing data they obtained from Facebook to manipulate political campaigns by user specific and psychological profiling. In this era, the TV is out of many viewers’ sight, the relationship between institutional interests and mainstream reality still exists on social media.

Billions of people are living in this alternative perfect world of social media and instantly face many political, personal and social changes. Baran and Davis explore this change through *The Commodification Culture Theory* through questioning what happens when a culture is mass produced. It is clear that the “happy-go-ideology of social media” (Fuchs, 2014) where everybody is extremely sensitive to political issues, extremely happy in their social life and extremely successful in their jobs creates a *culture*. This culture is created by social media corporates like Facebook, Instagram, Snapchat, Twitter and Youtube where a lot of people are in at constant race to upload filtered images of their social life and social identity. Just like with cultivation theory, commodification of the culture theory should be revived to study social media since the following question by Baran and Davis is vital:

- “What are the consequences of lifting bits of the culture of everyday life out of their context, repackaging them, and then marketing them back to people?” (Baran& Davis, 2012, p. 348)

When applied to social media, the question above takes the following form: Social media platforms receive people's individual information, photographs, opinions, communities and data. This, allows them to format, edit and present the data as they want and allow them to exist on the platform as an ideal character. This character is commercially and politically targeted, reshaped and influenced, in another words, distorted:

“Disruption of everyday life takes many forms—some disruptions are obviously linked to consumption of especially deleterious content, but other forms are very subtle and occur over long periods. Disruption ranges from propagation of misconceptions about the social world—like those cultivation analysis has examined—to disruption of social institutions.” (Baran & Davis, 2012, p. 350)

From this analysis, with the emergence of social media, it can be proposed to switch the keyword *disruption*, to *distortion* in meaning making theories.

Conclusion

Gerbner *et al*, in their study, *Living with Television: The Dynamics of the Cultivation* process, describe TV as a “distinctive feature of our age”...which “has become a symbolic environment that interacts with most of the things we think and do” (1986, p. 38) , Correspondingly, studying the long term effects of TV has helped developing models for further studies. Social media is currently the most engaging media platform that should be read institutionally and theoretically just like Gerbner applied to TV. Cultivation theory assisted to read the TV perceptions of the masses, yet, a critical communication theoretical perspective has not yet been established considering that the effect of social media is thought to be broader and longer than TV. Gerbner's research on these viewers produced the term resonance, a term which describes heavy viewers that demonstrates a higher level of cultivation because of their real life experiences. Potter (2014) exemplifies this as such: “People who live in dangerous high-crime neighborhoods and watch a lot of TV get a double dose of exposure to crime. Therefore, these people should exhibit a higher than average degree of cultivation from the television exposure because those TV exposures resonate with their real-world environment” (p. 1019). Potter also criticized cultivation theory for ignoring institutional analysis and for not studying the challenging effects of synthetic patterns in meaning construction; however, he agreed that the theory is valid for analyzing media effects. Stefanone *et al* (2010), on the other hand, conducted a research on the relationship between the consumers of reality television and user behavior on Facebook. The study reveals that the adopted behavior on viewed RTV is explicit on social networking sites as a reflected behavioral model, thus consumers become producers. The resonance effects of TV have thoroughly been investigated by Gerbner and his team. But no research is present whether the worldview of heavy social media users exhibits a certain degree of cultivation due to the content they are exposed to on social media. The future of cultivation is on social media as it has largely replaced TV. The existing networking communities on these platforms will require a message system, and an institutional and cultivation analysis for a better understanding of what the user cultivates from these platforms.

The alternative reality and culture that social media offer, distort people's perception of reality, numbs critical viewpoints and only exposes users to likeminded individuals. Baran looks at the importance of the media literacy movement and encourages the "ability to access, analyze, evaluate and communicate messages" (p. 351). The information age we live in makes media literacy a must. The need to value and interpret unverified, altered, filtered, sanitized or biased social media posts through cultivation theory, and a critical theoretical background on the use, value and impact of social media, should be generated for a more efficient outcome of audience/user analyses and communication theories on our communities and societies.

References

- Adoni, H., & Mane, S. (1984). Media and the social construction of reality: Toward an integration of theory and research. *Communication research*, 11(3), 323-340.
- Baran, S.J & Davis, D.K. (2012). *Mass Communication Theory: Foundations, Ferment and Future*. Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Bayraktar, F., & Amca, H. (2012). Interrelations between virtual-world and real-world activities: Comparison of genders, age groups, and pathological and nonpathological internet users. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 15(5), 263-269.
- Caers, R., de Feyter, T., de Couck, M., & et al. (2013). Facebook: A literature review. *New Media & Society*, 15(6), 982–1002.
- Collins, H. (2016). Social construction of reality. *Human Studies*, 39(1), 161-165.
- Gamson W. A. Croteau D. Hoynes W. and Sasson T.(1992). Media Images and the Social Construction of Reality, *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 18 (1992), pp. 373-393
- Gerbner, G. (1973). Cultural indicators: The third voice. *Communications technology and social policy*, 11(1), 555-573.
- Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., & Signorielli, N. (1986). Living with television: The dynamics of the cultivation process. *Perspectives on media effects*, 1986, 17-40.
- Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., Signorielli, N., & Shanahan, J. (2002). Growing up with television: Cultivation processes. *Media effects: Advances in theory and research*, 2, 43-67.
- Glynn, C. J., Huges, M., Reineke, J., Hardy, B. and Shanahan, J. 2007. When Oprah intervenes: Political correlates of daytime talk show viewing. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 51(2): 228–244.
- Gross, L., (2009). My media studies: cultivation to participation. *Television & New Media*, 10(1), 66-68.
- Gross, K., & Aday, S. (2003). The scary world in your living room and neighborhood: Using local broadcast news, neighborhood crime rates, and personal experience to test agenda setting and cultivation. *Journal of Communication*, 53(3), 411-426.
- Hauben, M., & Hauben, R. (1998). Netizens: On the history and impact of Usenet and the Internet. *First Monday*, 3(7).
- Herzog, H. (1941). On borrowed experience: An analysis of listening to daytime sketches. *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung*, 9(1), 65-95
- Klapper, J. T. (1960). The effects of mass communications.

Lynch, M., & McConatha, D. (2006). Hyper-symbolic interactionism: Prelude to a refurbished theory of symbolic interaction or just old wine?. *Sociological Viewpoints*, 22.

McQuail, D. (Ed.). (1972). *Sociology of mass communications: Selected readings* (Vol. 961). Penguin Books.

Morgan, M., Shanahan, J., & Signorielli, N. (2015). Yesterday's new cultivation, tomorrow. *Mass Communication and Society*, 18(5), 674-699.

Morgan, M., & Shanahan, J. (2010). The state of cultivation. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 54(2), 337-355.

Potter, W. J. (2014). A critical analysis of cultivation theory. *Journal of Communication*, 64(6), 1015-1036.

Saito, S. (2007). Television and the cultivation of gender-role attitudes in Japan: Does television contribute to the maintenance of the status quo?. *Journal of communication*, 57(3), 511-531.

Stefanone, M. A., Lackaff, D., & Rosen, D. (2010). The relationship between traditional mass media and "social media": Reality television as a model for social network site behavior. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 54(3), 508-525.

Weitzer, R., & Kubrin, C. E. (2004). Breaking news: How local TV news and real-world conditions affect fear of crime. *Justice Quarterly*, 21(3), 497-520.

Woo, H. J., & Dominick, J. R. (2001). Daytime television talk shows and the cultivation effect among US and international students. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 45(4), 598-614.

Contact email: raziye.nevzat@emu.edu.tr