Diversity, Pluralism and News Framing: An Analysis

Ajaz Ahmad Gilani*

Abstract
The notions of diversity and pluralism have always been challenging for scholars across disciplines both conceptually as well as methodologically. While conventionally, diversity implies 'existence of many' however this understanding of the term is superseded due to the scholars' disagreement over such connotations. Part of the reason for such disagreement is that diversity is most often used synonymously with pluralism. This paper addresses the issues in the usages of the terms diversity and pluralism and argues that diversity is a precondition for pluralism. It provides a model for approaching pluralism within media and communication studies through examining its usages across disciplines. This paper also offers the ways of mapping diversity within news media through the analytical inputs about how various scholars have approached this phenomenon. It simultaneously tries to explore the inter-linkages between diversity, news framing and how it contributes to quality journalism. This paper is believed to steer the researchers into empirically exploring diversity and pluralism in news media.

Keywords
Diversity, Pluralism, Democracy, Journalism, News Framing

Introduction:
The notions of diversity can be traced from the Constitution itself which provides for the equality and freedom to its citizens in a variety of forms. Considered as one of the largest democracies in the world in terms of its plurality, India comprises of people with "different religious, cultural or linguistic traditions [are] treated as equal citizens and [are] subject to no disability because they did not share the tradition that happens to be that of a numerical majority of the population" (Redmond 1978, p. 40). All these existent groups in the country have their own cultural patterns

---

*   Department of Sociology, University of Kashmir, Srinagar, J&K
     Email: ajaz.gilani@gmail.com

which differ from others based on their geographical locations and ethnicity. Owing to such multicultural disposition, the usage of the term diversity in daily discourses has become a common practice. The common connotations of the term diversity implies the existence of many within a given setting, but this conventional understanding of diversity is obsolete owing to the disputes among scholars in considering it merely as the existence of many. Part of the reason for this dispute is the fact that diversity has most often been used synonymously with pluralism – a phenomenon which will be dealt in the latter sections of this paper. Scholars across disciplines have attached different meanings to the term diversity which keeps swinging from one to the other. However those who engage with these terms, more particularly scholars from media and communication studies as well as social sciences, have since long been concerned with conceptualizing the notions of diversity. While social scientists define diversity in terms of the factors such as race, culture, region and so on, but the determining factors of diversity for scholars from media and communication studies include parameters such as sources, resources, contents, speakers, language and so on (Maltese et al., 2009). Karppinen (2006) emphasizes that "...diversity clearly denotes heterogeneity on some level, it can be defined in any number of ways and it can refer to any aspect of the media: sources, outlets, opinions as well as genres and representations" (p.60). Here diversity denotes a variety of contents presented by multiple numbers of speakers to a variety of audiences reflecting diverse opinions and focussing on different issues.

While Karppinen (2006) used the term heterogeneity in defining the term diversity but the term heterogeneity does not point towards a variety of opinions. Nevertheless it does encompass most of the dimensions mentioned above. However this does not suffice for the democratic functioning of media, if it otherwise guarantees that media is fair and unbiased in disseminating variety of information, through a variety of media sources on a variety of issues in a variety of languages and so on, to cater to the needs of a variety of people spread across different geographical locations and this is one prerequisite of media pluralism. Pluralism *per se* implies existence of diverse social groups wherein there is "acceptance, recognition and tolerance" which ensures "peace and tranquillity" among these social groups (Das & Gilani, n. d). Amartya Sen (1993) out rightly enunciated: "experiencing pluralism is, for us Indians, an easy virtue (it is all around us), but practising it is a different matter altogether – it demands much more of us. Being born as Indians, we find ourselves in a culture that has had thousands of years of flourishing diversity, in a community that is proud of its major languages and literatures, in a polity that tolerates dissent and a substantial

heterogeneity of political ideas, and in a country that has persistently tried to make room for different religious beliefs" (p. 37). This is one way of understanding pluralism which is common among scholars from social science disciplines. However considering this principle to delineate pluralism in media and communication studies especially news media, one may aptly define news pluralism in terms of "fair distribution" (Rescher, 2002) of, or equal treatment to, a variety of news forms as pointed out by Das & Gilani (n. d) such as social, cultural, religious, political, geographical, linguistic and so on.

Scholars within the disciplines of media and communication studies have used an array of terms to epitomize the prevailing media milieu such as "communicative abundance" (Keane, 1999), "cultural chaos" (McNair, 2006), "multiculturalism" (Taylor et al., 1994). Taking into consideration these terms informing the profusion of information being made available to the masses, diversity and pluralism are becoming a common discourse among academicians within these disciplines. However social science researchers, particularly sociologists and anthropologists, have employed pluralism model as a framework to the study of culture. Scholars from media and communication studies in India have embraced the concept apprehensively owing to its limited usage within the discipline. The idea is not to engage much in offering the conventional understanding of diversity or pluralism; instead emphasis will be laid on the issues of diversity and pluralism within Indian news media. In the following section, focus will be laid more on how the notions of diversity and pluralism have been understood in social sciences considering various dimensions and its subsequent transformation in media and communication studies particularly news media.

Notions of news pluralism and the trajectories
Pluralism as a concept in media and communication studies has seemingly to do with broadcasting varieties however its usage across disciplines is a dispute. Scholars contend the importance of media pluralism in the modern societies in terms of the plurality and heterogeneity of contents, sources, ownership, and so on within the news media, which they believe is a condition for the sound functioning of democracy (McQuail, 1992; Stirling, 1998; Cuilenburg, 1998, 1999; Napoli, 1999; Karppinen, 2006). The Republic of India, which is considered as the world's largest democracy, is inhabited by people characterized by greater level of differences identified through factors such as language, religion, culture, ethnicity, geographical location and so on. These factors gauge the diversity of the country wherein, despite differences on varied grounds, people exchange information and opinions among each other

which they think will serve the society (Doyle, 2002). People tend to accept and value information and opinions exchanged thus creating an atmosphere of coherence which in turn increases the level of acceptance, recognition and tolerance among people with differing socio-cultural, socio-economic and socio-political traits (See: Chavez & Weisinger, 2008). This is one way of understanding the notions of pluralism especially within the disciplines of social sciences. However, scholars from media and communication studies generally associated pluralism with media diversity, which they believe is linked to the fundamental rights as mentioned in the Constitution of India.

In trying to determine how pluralism can be arrived at or the ways of determining the level of pluralism in media, scholars argue that the notions of pluralism are completely ubiquitous. In news media, pluralism deals more with the dissemination of information to the audiences. It also deals with reflection and representation through media contents disseminated to the public. While there are constitutional provisions for promoting diversity, in general, but there are also provisions for promoting media diversity through various regulatory agencies which can broadly be categorised at three levels – executive level, judicial level and legislative level. Though, I may not delve into the regulatory aspects of news media which *per se* invites discourses on a broader level, however with the advancement of technology and also when the world has stepped into an era of abundance (of news sources available through digital media), the conventional understanding of pluralism within media has seen a drastic change in terms of the expansion of sources. Scholars however differ over a variety of factors such as ownership patterns, control, contents, actors, voices, audiences, disparities, balance, and so on as the measures of diversity (McQuail, 1992; Stirling, 1998; Cuilenburg, 1998, 1999; Napoli, 1999; Doyle, 2002; Karppinen, 2006). All these factors come broadly under internal and external pluralism (Gibbons 1998, Karppinen, 2006, 2013). Some scholars went beyond such contestations and argue that while these can be used to determine the level of diversity, they fail to inform about what constitutes pluralism. They claim that within diversity is the idea of recognition, acceptance, and tolerance, having its roots on the principle of justice and fairness, which inform about the levels of pluralism (*see:* Das & Gilani, n. d.). Recognition implies identification of the contents based on differences; acceptance involves an act of receiving without any bias; and tolerance involves the power to endure the differences. Now keeping all these three aspects into consideration while imagining of diversity within the news media, pluralism involves the "proportionate representation of issues within the news media". News media though is obliged to promote democracy, but

it is also "charged with a duty to provide the necessary resources for effective citizenship" (Murdock and Golding 1989, p.183).

To support their claim that news media is under an obligation to promote democracy, Murdock and Golding (1989) identified three kinds of relations between communications and citizenship i.e. 'access to information', 'access to broadest possible range of information' and recognition through 'representation'. 'Access to information' enables citizens to get familiar with the 'fundamental rights' and also 'allows them to pursue their rights effectively' thus ensuring freedom of 'information and expression'; the second kind of relation i.e. 'access to broadest possible range of information' allows citizens to debate on political issues for making choices through offering diversity of contents and also using communication facilities to file their criticism or to propose further courses of action; and the third relation is concerned with the idea of recognition through 'representation', according to which citizens 'must be able to recognize themselves and their aspirations in the range of representations offered within the central communications sectors and be able to contribute to developing those representations' (Murdock and Golding 1989, p. 183-84). These three forms of relations between citizens and communication system, which inform about the obligations of the communication system as well the rights of the citizens', suggest that the operational mechanism of communication system must be two-fold: one, that it must 'offer maximum possible diversity of provision and provide mechanisms for user feedback and participation' at the 'production level'; and secondly, it must 'guarantee universal access to the services that can ensure the exercise of citizenship' irrespective of the 'income' or geographical boundaries at the 'consumption level' (Murdock and Golding 1989, p. 184).

While the debate is on news diversity and pluralism, one can then ask whether every media outlet should supply the same contents to its audiences and in the same way as other media outlets do. Since diversity is a precondition for pluralism and the roots of diversity can be traced through differences in the media contents, news media must reflect such differences through 'voices, ideas and opinions' (Das & Gilani, n. d.). For example, if audiences use only one channel during a certain period of time when other news channels broadcast the similar contents during the same time, then audiences may subscribe only one news channel; if otherwise the different channels broadcast different contents or if the format of the news is different which involves a process called news-framing, discussed in the latter sections. Subscription of more than one news channels requires that the audiences are exposed to a variety of news items and that such variety of news contents reflect different voices,

perspectives, viewpoints, ideas and opinions (See: Balcytiene, 2009). These various elements reflecting diversity have been categorized by scholars under two broad perspectives as mentioned earlier i.e. internal and external pluralism (Gibbons 1998, Karppinen, 2006, 2013).

Internal pluralism can be arrived through the diversity of contents within the single media outlet and can be determined through analysing news media contents at two levels – micro level and macro level. At micro level, news contents of one particular media outlet can be analysed to gauge pluralism through mapping the proportion of all contents broadcast. For instance considering an Indian bi-lingual television news channel Aaj Tak, if this channel presents a variety of news contents each different from the other, then Aaj Tak presents the diversity of contents to audiences regardless of the exposure diversity. At the same time, if diversity of contents are proportionally presented (in terms of the time given to each content for representation), one can conclude that there is pluralism in Aaj Tak. At the macro-level, internal pluralism can be measured within various media outlets, say for instance NDTV, Aaj Tak and Zee News. Suppose these three channels broadcast news containing similar contents but if the format of the news broadcast on each of these channels is different from the rest, it can be said that there is pluralism (internal) provided that other contents are presented fairly and in the similar format. Therefore differences and fair representation are two key elements that determine internal pluralism within the news media. Or in other words, internal pluralism can be reached through equal representation of a variety of contents through diverse voices (Doyle, 2002). Also while internal pluralism contains the diversity of contents, but such diversity must cover/reflect/represent the issues of diverse sections of a larger society (Wauters et al., 2012). Thomas Gibbons (2015) advocates that despite 'media organizations' taking active role in the manifestation of a highest level of internal pluralism, however, they must also ensure that not a single 'institutional perspective 'predominates', which helps create spaces for new ideas and opinions to emerge (p. 1394).

External pluralism is realized through the existence of a multiple number of news media outlets. Hallin and Mancini defined external pluralism as "pluralism achieved at the level of the media system as a whole, through the existence of a range of media outlets or organizations reflecting the points of view of different groups or tendencies in society" (2004, p. 29). This definition suggests that external pluralism is concerned with the diversity of media structures such as ownership diversity, media outlet diversity, channel diversity, and so on. Also, external pluralism exists when there is the diversity of news owners i.e. the news suppliers (Doyle, 2002). Scholars argue that the demand to promote external pluralism in

news media is running down the scale due to the evolution of digital media where audiences are free to choose any source and the internet also allows freedom of expression to the users (See: Humphreys, 2009).

News and the criteria for news framing

News is perhaps as old as 'Man' itself. As a primal concept free from any concrete definition in its conventional usage, news is assimilated in our lives to such an extent that it would be unjust to enquire about its existence. However in attempting to trace the origin of news within the media, one has to go back to the 15th century when the first news account appeared in Johannes Gutenberg's printing press (Campbell et al., 2011). By the end of 20th century, news has been understood only as a means of getting information about the daily occurrences within and outside of the country. These were brought to us through print media. The construction of news and the intrinsic practices of its making have been bluntly frowned upon by the scholars from media and communication studies (Schudson, 1989). There is no precise operational definition of news in social science disciplines either. However if one quests for a substantial definition of the term news, one would arrive at Gitlin's (1980) definition who stated that news is "a routine, universalizable definition - comes to naught" (p. 268).

During 20th century, the dissemination of news witnessed a major shift from the previously press operating as the news-making institution to other means such as television, radio (Shoemaker, 2006) as well as digital media, social media and so on during the beginning of 21st century. Also, while the term 'news' is still existent but 'current affairs' appeared as an extension to the parent term 'news'. The usage of the phrase 'current affairs' can vary from discipline to discipline, however for the sake of providing a deeper insight into what constitutes news and the inclusion of the phrase 'current affairs' within it stands as a justification to the fact that news can appear in its various forms. While conventionally, the term 'current' may inform the 'flow' of something; but in media and communication studies, the term 'affairs' is always correlated with the affairs of a nation-state that affects not only the nation, but the communities and even people individually. Online news as well as news through portable devices can be the sources providing quick access to current affairs. These sources have gone beyond the precincts of the national network and turning world into a 'network society' (Castells, 2004). Thus if there is absence of the forms of news media as they existed primarily, the flow of information from person to person or from nation to nation will not be thwarted. It will sustain in its alternative forms in the contemporary times. But whether online sources affect the context of the news depends largely on how news is framed. The concept of news frame

was initially introduced by Erving Goffman (1974) to mean an organized set of contexts which provides audiences with a sense of what reality is, however it later came to be considered as "one of the most fertile areas of current research in journalism and mass communication" (Riffe 2004, p. 2). Entman (1993) points out:

> Framing essentially involves selection and salience. To frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described (p. 52).

Jennings & Miron (2004) argue that the underlying idea of framing is that it controls and shapes the perceptions and representations of reality for its audiences – the two fundamental components informing the psychological and sociological foundations of framing. Sociological foundations of news framing point towards structural components utilized in the making of news frames such as "words, images, phrases, and presentation styles" (Druckman, 2001; p.227). On the other hand, psychological perspective suggests how audiences react to the news frames through their 'cognitive schemata' (Goffman, 1974). Scholars such as Kahneman and Tversky (1984) fervently studied the methods of constructing the audience frames to explore how news framing persuades decision-making among its audiences. They exhibited how the diversity of news frames offering the same news can manipulate people's decisions in making a selection. This psychological influence of news informs that framing is most often coupled with certain agenda (*see* McCombs & Shaw (1972; *also see* McCombs & Ghanem, 2001). Opposing McCombs' claim that news framing entails certain kind of agenda, scholars such as de Vreese (2005) and Maher (2001) argue that framing predominantly involves the presentation of the issues and deals with the context of the news rather than salience. de Vreese (2005) points out that "a frame is an emphasis in salience of different aspects of a topic" (p. 53). They are only the 'alternative ways' to delineate problems that are endogenous to audiences both politically and socially. Therefore how audiences think about the news frame is largely based on the 'activation model' unlike the 'accessibility model' which identifies the audiences interested in locating agenda within the frame (See: Scheufele, 2000). The diversity of news frames entails the diversity of ideas *per se* or as scholars call it 'internal diversity' (Gibbons 1998, Komorek 2009, Karppinen, 2006, 2013), ensuring the standardized flow of information from media towards its audiences.

The diversity of sources as well as the diversity of news frames enables its audiences to widen their coherent inclinations. On the contrary, Porto

(2007, p.314) argues, "When the range of cues in citizens' environment is restricted, serious obstacles emerge for citizen competence". The citizen competence largely depends upon the 'instinctive attributes' of the events or of the information which makes news newsworthy. These instinctive attributes have been termed by scholars as 'news values' (See, for example, Galtung and Ruge, 1965). John Galtung and Mari Ruge (1965) pointed out certain values (such as frequency, threshold, interpretation, cultural proximity, mental pre-image or predicted, unexpected or rare) that are a precondition for an event, information or people to be considered as news. However, the selection of news as per its values does not correspond to its framing which is more about the presentation of news.

Within the discipline of mass communication, Entman (1993) has offered 'four illustrations of theoretical debates' of news framing (p.56). The first illustration is the 'audience autonomy'. Considering 'dominant meaning' central to framing, it consists of "problem, causal, evaluative, and treatment interpretations with the highest probability of being noticed, processed, and accepted by the most people" (Entman 1993, p. 56). A particular frame can be considered as dominant only if the frequency of certain text is high within the frame and "congruent with the most common audience schemata" (p. 56). The second illustration is the 'journalistic objectivity' according to which "Journalists may follow the rules for "objective" reporting and yet convey a dominant framing of the news text that prevents most audience members from making a balanced assessment of a situation" (Entman 1993, p. 56). Entman (1993) argues that since journalists lack the common understanding about framing, naively they can inflict their 'dominant frames' on the news. The well versed the journalists with the objectivity, the reporting will be in equilibrium throughout the media environment. The third illustration is content analysis, one of the key functions of which is to determine the 'textual meaning' of and identify and describe the frames in the news. It thus informs the coders of drawing conclusions about the dominant meanings without measuring the salience of the objects and claims that content analysis, due to being unguided by the framing paradigm, often yield data that 'misrepresent' those media messages that are mostly picked up by the 'audience members'. The fourth and the last illustration is the 'public opinion and normative democratic theory'. The framing of events or other issues in the news media influences the democratic process which in turn affects the events being presented in the media. All these four illustrations suggested by Robert Entman (1993) can co-exist in one media presentation however they may or may not be found in all the frames (Abdullah & Hamid, 2010).

Framing for journalists signifies a process of simplifying intricate information for the public to comprehend (Scheufele and Tewksbury, 2007). It insinuates how news frames offered to the audiences affects their way of interpreting the frames for which scholars (such as McCombs & Shaw, 1972) call framing as a second-level agenda-setting i.e. how to think about some specific matter. Such a discourse on media framing tells about two levels of the construction of news – the 'macro-level' and the 'micro-level' news construction (Scheufele, 1999; Scheufele & Tewksbury, 2007). Considering framing as a 'macroconstruct' entails the ways in which news is communicated by journalists and other communicators to the audiences in a way to 'resonate' with the audiences' prior knowledge about the issue (Scheufele & Tewksbury, 2007; Shoemaker & Reese, 2014). It indicates that framing is a way to trim down the intricacies of the news for the better understanding of and interpretation by the audiences as pointed out earlier. On the contrary, framing as microconstruct, according to Scheufele & Tewksbury (2007), illustrates "how people use information and presentation features regarding issues as they form impressions" (p. 12). These two levels within the journalistic standards of news framing empower journalists to produce information and present it to the audiences in such a way that it stimulates a specific reaction from the public. But beyond the framing of news, what are the possible ways through which diversity can be monitored and mapped within the news media is a question that requires exploration.

Nexus between diversity and quality journalism

How one defines quality journalism is a question coupled with the criteria for quality journalism within news media. Before attempting to deal with the principles of quality journalism, emphasis will initially be laid on the notions of journalism; subsequently the focus will shift towards quality journalism as well as its allied aspects. Journalism *per se* is the practice of collecting information, assessing, filtering and presenting it to the audiences. But how does this sort of communication differ from other forms of communication depends largely upon the elements of journalism which makes it a vital organ of democracy. Scholars argue that the democracy of a country is reflected through the variety of information and news that media possesses and presents to its viewers (See for example, Coronel, n. d.).

Ramananda Chatterjee long back in 1929 wrote:

> It is obvious that the spread of literacy and education has greatly to do with the progress of journalism and journalistic success. Political freedom and economic prosperity are other factors in

such progress and success. Religious and social freedom also are indispensable for progress in journalism (1929, p. 165).

Thus, while journalism contains supplying of information and ideas to the masses, it also requires maintaining transparency, which is vital to any democracy. In addition to this, as Chatterjee (1929) pointed out, political freedom and economic prosperity are the keys to ensuring quality journalism in media and communications. Now delving into the idea of 'quality' within journalism, it reflects the capabilities of journalism to positively play its role in disseminating information that will mould the thinking capabilities of citizens towards making decisions. Picard (2000) points out: "the issue of the quality of journalism is not merely a question of increasing the value of a product to consumers. Rather, quality is a central element in achieving the social, political, and cultural goals asserted for journalism in democratic societies" (p. 97). Dennis McQuail looked at the idea of 'quality' within the media through 'media performance', which according to him "set[s] out and examine[s] the record of a particular, though very broad, tradition of enquiry into the working of the mass media in their potential 'public interest' capacity" (1992, p. 11; Also see Czepek, 2009). McQuail (1992) hypothesized that the assessment of the diversity of news contents is essential to evaluate media performance in a democracy. Napoli (1999) considers diversity an essential element to advocate broader objectives of our societies. His diversity approach, which represents an effective democracy, is purely based on the marketplace of ideas, which "has served as a guiding principle" for various diversity enhancing policies (Napoli, 1999; p.9). His three-fold diversity approach serves to determine the quality of journalism but what is of significance to the audiences is how contents are framed for presentation to them, which is again an issue concerned with how the journalists perform their roles in framing the news. The studies conducted by Phillip Napoli (1999) and Dennis McQuail (1992), in principle, point towards the contribution of source diversity and content diversity in measuring news quality.

There are several ways to assess quality journalism within news media. Cuilenburg (2000) pointed out four levels which help evaluate the diversity in news journalism which further helps measure the quality in journalism. These are (a) *content units* – a level through which reflective and open diversity can be studied within individual content units of information such as television program or a newspaper article where focus will be on difference preferences and opinions presented in the programs or articles; (b) *content bundles* – a level through which reflective and open diversity can be understood within a large volume of contents such as broadcasting channel or a newspaper through which a multitude

of programmes/articles are presented to the audiences as a 'total package' by individual media outlet; (c) *medium type* – a level through which reflective and open diversity can be measured through certain medium such as radio, television or any daily newspaper by focussing on the diversity of content supply within their respective markets; and (d) *society's communications system* – wherein reflective and open diversity can be gauged within the broader system of a society as a whole such as broadcasting, newspapers, internet, and so on (Cuilenburg, 2000; p. 55).

Going beyond the four levels mentioned above, Cuilenburg (2000) has offered yet another way of dealing with the content diversity in the media market, which informs about another dimension of measuring quality within the news media contents thus differentiating between '*intra medium diversity*' and '*inter media diversity*' as forms of diversity in the media contents characterized by 'diversity within a specific content package' and diversity 'between all content packages' respectively within the media market (Cuilenburg, 2000; p. 56). Considering 'intra-diversity' as important from a 'societal point of view', Cuilenburg (2000) accentuated this will vouch that the diversity of ideas and opinions will be confronted by the audiences. Inter diversity on the other hand is important for individual users in the sense that it facilitates selection of a content package as per their preferences among other packages. McQuail (1992) believes that in addition to diversity being the goal of media outlets, it equally is thought of as a means to accomplish the societal goals. Napoli (1999) considers diversity as a 'policy objective' conferring a sense of 'social responsibility' to the media. Thus while one speaks of quality journalism within media, one might specify content diversity and source diversity as the means of measuring it (Napoli, 1999; Cuilenburg, 2000, McQuail, 1992). Though, for instance, one specific content may not probably reflect the diversity of sources, however if one attempts to measure the diversity, one needs to evaluate all the contents presented to the audiences during the day, which invites reactions from the audiences. In fact, the criteria for quality journalism can be arrived at through the journalistic practices such as offering diversity of contents to audiences through diversity of sources. Diversity of contents or sources can be understood in terms of the degree of proportionality in the representation of various dimensions of news contents such as social, political, economic, geographic, and so on which, as mentioned earlier, reflects the robust functioning of democracy.

Conclusion:
While diversity is a self-existing character in a variety of fields including media and communication studies but pluralism within news media has

remained an ambiguous concept among scholars across disciplines and both these terms have been understood synonymously depending largely on the usage of the terms. But whether academicians or scholars should worry about news pluralism given the diversity of sources in the age of digitalization and evolution of convergence media is a debatable issue and also requires exploration. This chapter offers an integrated understanding of diversity through identifying various elements such as contents, outlets, sources, audiences, exposure, frames, and so on thus opening up the horizons to evaluate the degree of diversity within the news media. Concurrently, the chapter informs about the notions of pluralism and the disparities in how scholars have used this phenomenon in social sciences and media studies, taking into consideration the parameters, which differ from discipline to discipline. Journalists are always under an obligation to ensure the functioning of democracy within the operational capacities of the media outlets through maintaining diversity of news frames and thus emphasis is laid towards maintaining quality within the journalistic profession. While the debates on news diversity and pluralism have been a common discourse in Europe and other western countries, but in India, such debates are still in its infancy stage. This chapter is an attempt to channel the researchers and academicians to empirically explore diversity and pluralism in news media.

References:

- Abdullah, S. A. & Hamid, H. (2010) "*Media framing of waste issues in selected Malaysian Newspapers*", Journal of Human Capital Development, Vol. 3, No.1; pp. 41-54
- Balcytiene, A. (2009) "*Assessing Pluralism and the Democratic Performance of the Media in a Small Country: Setting a Comparative Research Agenda for the Baltic States*", In Czepek, A., Hellwig, M. & Nowak, E. (Eds.) "*Press freedom and pluralism in Europe: Concepts and conditions*", (pp. 129-139), UK, US: Intellect
- Campbell, R., et al., (2011) "*Media essentials: A brief introduction*", Bedford press
- Castells, M. (2004) "*Informationalism, networks, and the network society: A Theoretical Blueprint*", In Manuel Castells (Ed.) "*The network society: A cross-cultural perspective*" (pp. 3-45), Edward Elgar
- Chatterjee, R. (1929) "*Origin and growth of journalism among Indians*", The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Vol. 145, Part 2; pp. 161-168

- Chavez, C. I. & Weisinger, J. Y. (2008) "*Beyond diversity training: A social infusion for cultural inclusion*", Human Resource Management, Vol. 47, No. 2; pp. 331–350

- Coronel, S. S. (n. d.) "*The role of the media in deepening democracy*"; Retrieved from: http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un/unpan010194.pdf

- Cuilenburg, J. V. (1998) "*Diversity revisited: Towards a critical rational model of media diversity*"; In K. Brants, J. Hermes and L. Van Zoonen (eds.), "*The Media in Question: Popular cultures and public interests*", (pp. 38-49), London: Sage

- Cuilenburg, J. V. (1999) "*On competition, access and diversity in media, old and new: Some remarks for communications policy in the information age*", New Media & Society, Vol. 1, No. 2; pp. 183-207

- Cuilenburg, J. V. (2000) "*On measuring media competition and media diversity: Concepts, theories and methods*", In Robert G. Picard, (ed.), "*Measuring media content, quality and diversity: Approaches and issues in content research*", (pp. 51-84), Business and Research Development Centre, Turku School of Economics and Business Administration; Turku, Finland

- Czepek, A. (2009) "*Pluralism and Participation as Desired Results of Press Freedom: Measuring Media System Performance*", In Czepek, A., Hellwig, M. & Nowak, E. (Eds.) "*Press freedom and pluralism in Europe: Concepts and conditions*", (pp. 37-44), UK, US: Intellect

- Das, B. & Gilani, A. A. (n. d.) "*News diversity and pluralism*", An epg-pathshala module in Media and Communication Studies; Retrieved from: http://epgp.inflibnet.ac.in

- De Vreese, C. H. (2005). "*News framing: Theory and typology*", Information Design Journal + Document Design, Vol. 13, No. 1; pp. 51 – 62

- Doyle, G. (2002) "*Media ownership: The economics and politics of convergence and concentration in the UK and European media*", London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage

- Druckman, J. (2001) "*The implications of framing effects for citizen competence*", Political Behavior, Vol. 23, No. 3; pp. 225–256

- Entman, R. M. (1993) "*Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm*", Journal of Communication, Vol. 43, No. 4; pp. 51–58

- Galtung, J. & Ruge, M. (1965) "*The structure of foreign news: The presentation of the Congo, Cuba and Cyprus crises in four Norwegian newspapers*", Journal of International Peace Research, Vol. 1; pp. 64-91

- Gibbons, T. (1998) "*Regulating the media*", (2nd revised edition), London, UK: Sweet & Maxwell
- Gibbons, T. (2015) "*Active pluralism: Dialogue and engagement as basic media policy principles*", International journal of communication, Vol. 9; pp. 1382–1399; Available at: http://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/2762/1371
- Gitlin, T. (1980) "*The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making and unmaking of the New Left*" Vol. XIV, Berkeley: The University of California Press
- Goffman, E. (1974) "*Frame Analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*", NY: Harper & Row
- Hallin, D. C. & Mancini, P. (2004) "*Comparing media systems: Three models of media and politics*", Cambridge University Press
- Humphreys, P. (2009) "*Media freedom and pluralism in the United Kingdom (UK)*", In Czepek, A., Hellwig, M. & Nowak, E. (Eds.) "*Press freedom and pluralism in Europe: Concepts and conditions*", (pp. 197-211), UK, US: Intellect
- Jennings, B. & Miron, D. (2004) "*Theory and research in mass communication*", Journal of Communication, Vol. 54, No. 4; pp. 662 – 704
- Kahneman, D. & Tversky, A. (1984) "*Choices, values, and frames*", American Psychologist, Vol. 39, No. 4; pp. 341–350
- Karppinen, K. (2006) "*Media diversity and the politics of criteria: Diversity assessment and technocratisation of European media policy*", Nordicom Review; Vol.27, No.2, pp. 53-68
- Karppinen, K. (2013) "*Rethinking media pluralism*", New York: Fordham University Press
- Keane, J. (1999) "*Public life in the era of communicative abundance*", Canadian Journal of Communication, Vol. 24, No. 2, pp. 165—78
- Komorek, E. (2009). "*Is media pluralism a human right*", The European Court of Human Rights, The Council of Europe and the Issue of Media Pluralism; Issue 3, European Human Rights Law Review; pp. 395-414
- Maher, M. (2001) "Framing: An emerging paradigm or a phase of agenda setting? In S.D. Reese, O.H. Gandy & A.E. Grant (Eds.), *Framing Public Life: Perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world*, (pp. 83-94), New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Maltese, V. et al., (2009) "*On the interdisciplinary foundations of diversity*", Paper presented at 1st international workshop on living web: making web diversity a true asset, 25th October, 2009;

Washington DC: USA; Available at: http://eprints.biblio.unitn.it/1651/1/040.pdf

- McCombs, M. E. & Ghanem, S. I. (2001) "*The convergence of agenda setting and framing*", In S.D. Reese, O.H. Gandy & A.E. Grant (Eds.), *Framing Public Life: Perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world,* (pp. 67-81), New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum

- McCombs, M. E. & Shaw, D. L. (1972) "*The agenda-setting function of mass media*", The Public Opinion Quarterly, Vol. 36, No. 2; pp. 176-187

- McNair, B. (2006) "*Cultural chaos − Journalism, news and power in a globalised world*", London: Routledge

- McQuail, D. (1992) "*Media performance: Mass communication and the public interest*", London, Sage

- Murdock, G. and Golding, P. (1989) "*Information poverty and political inequality: Citizenship in the age of privatized communications*", Journal of Communication, Vol.39, No. 3; pp. 180-95.

- Napoli, P. M. (1999) "*Deconstructing the diversity principle*", Journal of communication, Vol. 49, Issue 44, pp. 7-34

- Picard, R. G. (2000) "*Measuring quality by journalistic activity*", In Robert G. Picard, (ed.), "*Measuring media content, quality and diversity: Approaches and issues in content research*", (pp. 97-103), Business and Research Development Centre, Turku School of Economics and Business Administration; Turku, Finland

- Porto, M. P. (2007) "*Frame diversity and citizen competence: Towards a critical approach to news quality*", Critical Studies in Media Communication, Vol. 24 No. 4; pp. 303-321

- Redmond, M. (1978) "*Constitutional Aspects of Pluralism*", Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review, Vol. 67, No. 265/266, pp. 40-58

- Rescher, N. (2002) "*Fairness: Theory and practice of distributive justice*", US, UK: Transaction Publishers

- Riffe, D. (2004) "*An editorial comment*", Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly, Vol. 81, No. 1; pp. 2-3

- Scheufele, D. A. (1999) "*Framing as a theory of media effects*", Journal of Communication, Vol. 49, No. 1; pp. 103-122

- Scheufele, D. A. (2000) "*Agenda-setting, priming, and framing revisited: Another look at cognitive effects of political communication*", Mass communication & Society, Vol. 3, No. 2-3; pp. 297-316

- Scheufele, D. A. & Tewksbury, D. (2007) "*Framing, agenda setting, and priming: The evolution of three media effects models*", Journal of Communication; Vol. 57, No. 1, pp. 9-20
- Schudson, M. (1989) "*The Sociology of News Production*", In D. Berkowitz (Ed.) "*Social Meanings of News*", (pp. 7-30). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Sen, A. (1993) "*Indian Pluralism*", India International Centre Quarterly, Vol. 20, No. 3, pp. 37 – 46
- Shoemaker, P. J., & Reese, S. D. (2014) "*Mediating the Message in the 21st Century: A Media Sociology Perspective*" (3rd edition). NY, London: Routledge
- Shoemaker, P. J. (2006) "*News and newsworthiness: A commentary*", Communications, Vol. 31, pp. 105-111
- Stirling, A. (1998) "*On the economics and analysis of diversity*", Science Policy Research Unit, Electronic working papers series, Paper no.28, University of Sussex; Available at: http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.144.8 865&rep=rep1&type=pdf
- Taylor, C. et al., (1994) "*Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition*", New Jersey, Princeton University Press
- Wauters, E., Lievens, E. & Valcke, P. (2012) "Guaranteeing media pluralism and protecting minors in social media: The current legal framework", ICL & ICT. Available at: https://lirias.kuleuven.be/bitstream/123456789/350783/1/EMS OC_ICRI_D+1+2+2_2012.pdf