Annual Endowment Lecture on Gender and Development

in memory of Dr. Poornima Vyasulu

Institute of World Culture, Bangalore

13 May 2016

Whose media are they anyway?

Good evening.

Let me begin by thanking the Centre for Budget and Policy Studies, particularly its director, Jyotsna Jha, and its co-founder, Vinod Vyasulu, for doing me the honour and giving me the privilege of delivering the 4th lecture in the series dedicated to the memory of Poornima Vyasulu.

As I told Jyotsna when she first contacted me in this connection, I feel rather inadequate in this role. Unlike the last three speakers, I am not a scholar or researcher; nor am I an expert on gender or development, let alone the intersection of the two. I am essentially a journalist and my main area of inquiry (I wouldn't call it research) has been the media, particularly gender and/in the media. But, having been persuaded to accept the invitation, I will do my best to place the media, and especially women and the media, in the context of "development" in general and gender equality in particular.

Incidentally, you may be interested to know that the Finlandia Declaration adopted during the recent UNESCO World Press Freedom Day events in Helsinki, which I attended last week, noted that the new UN 2030 Development Agenda, and in particular Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 16 to promote just, peaceful and inclusive societies, includes key points relevant to press freedom, access to information, safety of journalists and the rule of law. It further noted that SDG target 16.10, which seeks to "ensure public access to information and protect fundamental freedoms, in accordance with national legislation and international agreements," is directly relevant to achieving all other SDG goals and in particular SDG 5 on gender equality.

I'm afraid I had only one opportunity to interact professionally with Poornima. Fortunately, that experience provides a segue into today's topic.

Whatever happened to Gramsat?

In February 1995, over 600 women members of gram panchayats in Karnataka participated in an exciting experiment in the use of satellite-based interactive communication for training. The effort was to provide newly elected women with the awareness and knowledge they needed to play an effective role in village-level institutions of local self-government.

The four-day event was then popularly known as the GramSat Programme (although it took place before India's first exclusive satellite for "development communication," was launched). The programme was a combination of pre-recorded footage (made by Deepa Dhanraj), live interaction between women participants in all the state's districts and a studio-based panel in Bangalore (comprising a different set of senior government servants and women activists every day), and informal, face-to-face dialogue between participants and resource persons at designated training centres in each district. Poornima was closely involved with this initiative and, if I remember correctly, anchored the panel of experts fielding questions from the elected women representatives.

I was merely the rapporteur and I documented the process in a report for the Government of Karnataka's Department of Women and Child Development (then headed by Anita Kaul), which had initiated the programme. I also wrote a couple of articles about it, as well as a chapter for a book titled, "Building Women's Capacities: Interventions in Gender Transformation," edited by Ranjani K. Murthy.

Unfortunately, as far as I know, the state government made no attempt to extend the programme to cover more, let alone all, women elected to GPs in Karnataka. In fact, it is not clear what has happened to the long-standing experiment conducted by the Development and Educational Communication Unit of the Indian Space Research Organisation in the use of communication via satellite to foster rural development.

According to an August 2015 Press Information Bureau report based on the reply to a question in Parliament, a "Gramsat Scheme" is currently being implemented in a few states (including Karnataka, apparently). But the fact that there is little information or discussion in the public sphere about what ever happened to GramSat – and EduSat and HealthSat – tells its own tale. The last reference I could find to such a satellite was to GramSat 12, launched in July 2011, and apparently still in service (unlike the earlier ones), which is supposed to provide services like tele-education, tele-medicine, disaster management support and satellite internet access.

Of course, communication technology has developed in leaps and bounds over the past couple of decades and, with the proliferation of mobile phones and even, now, smart phones, the potential to harness various technologies for the benefit of women and other historically

marginalised and disadvantaged sections of society has grown exponentially. Since this is not an area I have done much work in and many others here no doubt know far more than I do, I will refrain from going further into it – except to say that, as far as I know, while a number of civil society organisations are creatively enabling women and other groups to access available ICTs and use them to exercise their freedom of expression, right to information and right to communicate, I am not aware of efforts by the State to do the same.

In this context I would like to just briefly touch upon two other examples that highlight the State's role, if any, in ensuring equal access to media and communication.

Who's afraid of community radio?

One is community radio, which is widely believed to have tremendous potential to democratise communication in general and broadcasting in particular. Even though community radio (or CR) is relatively new in India – officially sanctioned only in 2006, after years of struggle – it has traditionally been inclusive, enabling a range of women (especially poor, illiterate, rural women) to exercise their communication rights.

In fact, some of the oldest and best known CR stations in India are effectively run by women from socially and economically disadvantaged communities, many of them with long experience in radio work, using various means of communication, even before their stations were granted broadcast licenses. An impressive number of women now work in CR across the country, mainly as producers and on-air talent but also, in some cases, as station managers. Several organisations are involved in training and mentoring grassroots women broadcasters, helping to improve their knowledge base, skills and self-confidence. Of course, women are still under-represented in decision-making roles and continue to face various challenges – such as customary social hierarchies of caste, class, religion and other identities, which often combine with gender to inhibit women's participation.

The State's role in this important sector of media has been largely negative. In fact, government regulations and procedures are widely seen as the biggest hurdle inhibiting the growth of CR in the country. First of all, only certain types of organisations and institutions – not communities themselves – are permitted to start radio stations. Mandatory clearances from several different ministries are required – despite the fact that neither CR nor private radio is allowed to broadcast news and current affairs in India: that remains the sole prerogative of the state/public broadcaster, All India Radio (incidentally, this restriction on radio alone is being challenged through a public interest litigation). The initial investment is also fairly substantial and there are restrictions on advertisements, which typically represent the main source of revenue for all media. A new Plan Scheme – "Supporting Community Radio Movement in India"

– has apparently been introduced to provide financial support to new as well as existing CR stations, but considering the government's record on CR so far, that doesn't hold out much hope.

A year after CR was legitimised it was estimated that India would soon have at least 4000 community radio stations but, eight years later, in 2015, only about 180 CR stations were operating in this huge country with its large population. Nepal, on the other hand, has 260. Of the nearly 700 applications received by the government since January 2012, just 11% were issued letters of intent.

To make matters worse, around this time last year the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting issued an order asking all CR stations to provide – on a daily basis – recordings of all programmes (in MP3 format), along with the logbook and the Q sheet. For most CR operators, already struggling to remain on air on shoe-string budgets, compliance would have been a financial, technological and logistical nightmare. Fortunately the order was withdrawn the very next day, but CR stations are in any case required to maintain archives for three months and the government is free to ask them to submit programming for scrutiny in case of complaints.

You may be interested to know that, despite the fact that no news or current affairs is permitted on CR, an exception has been made for the Prime Minister's monthly *Mann ki Baath*, which they (and private radio stations) are more or less obliged to broadcast.

These are just a few of the problems that beset this vital media sector that has the potential to improve people's – including women's -- access to freedom of expression and rights to information and communication. However, I would now like to move on to briefly touch upon television, particularly in terms of public service broadcasting.

Whose airwaves are they anyway?

The officially stated purpose for which television was brought into the country in 1959 was that it was a medium that could serve and benefit the majority of the population and, as Dr. Vikram Sarabhai put it, help the country to leapfrog out of a state of economic backwardness and social disabilities in decades rather than centuries. Twenty five years later it had evidently not quite fulfilled this purpose.

For example, the 1985 report of the Working Group on Software for Doordarshan, chaired by P.C. Joshi, had indicted the government financed and controlled broadcaster for failing to fulfil its expected role in furthering the stated national objective of women's equality. Spurred no doubt by the criticisms and recommendations of the Joshi Committee, Doordarshan embarked

on some affirmative action soon thereafter, not just through changes in traditional women's programming during the afternoon transmission, spots on the girl child, family welfare, and so on, but through prime time programmes such as *Adhikaar, Aur Bhi Hain Raahein, Udaan, Stri, Kashmakash, Swayamsiddha, Nirmala,* and so on. On an average two or three such serials were telecast on prime time every week in the mid to late 1980s and many of them became quite popular.

In the introduction to the section on television in the first (1994) edition of "Whose News? The Media and Women's Issues," edited by Kalpana Sharma and myself, Deepa Dhanraj was quite scathing in her assessment of Doordarshan's approach to women and programming for women, and her analysis of what she described as "the deluge of women-oriented serials" in the 1980s.

However, looking back over the tops of Ekta Kapoor's K serials (so called because the names of most began with a K, *Kyunki Saas Bhi Kabhi Bahu Thi* being the most famous, or infamous), as well as their clones, which dominated TV entertainment from the dawn of the millennium onwards, the 1980s appear to be a halcyon period, when it was still possible to think of television programming that addressed concerns like gender equality and women's empowerment.

I am not going to even enter the mine-field of private television news channels, their priorities and predilections, not to mention personalities – especially one particular gentleman, who shall remain un-named at least for now, and his clones. But it is interesting that more and more people – not only ultra-critical journalists – seem to be finding Doordarshan News, as well as the discussions on Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha TV, more agreeable and substantive than the cacophony of prime time "news" on private channels.

But somewhere along the way we have lost track of even the concept of public service broadcasting (or PSB). In an article I wrote in 2005 I had called attention to the fact that a parliamentary standing committee had asked what is supposed to be this country's public service broadcaster (though it remains unhealthily chained to the government) to reduce the airtime given to TV and radio programmes with social messages, on the ground that they fetch no revenue. The directive apparently came in response to submissions by both Doordarshan and AIR that they were obligated to devote thousands of hours to programmes that no private channel would touch because they were so unprofitable.

According to the panel, "A lot of time is consumed on Doordarshan for advertising on social causes, gender concerns, environmental campaigns et al, which involves a social obligation it has to fulfil in its capacity of being a government channel and for which there is no revenue." It concluded that the number of hours allotted for government and social broadcasting must be

limited so that Prasar Bharati can maintain a "meaningful balance between social obligations and financial considerations." What is more, the panel favoured a redefining of Prasar Bharati's role and possible restructuring so that it can play a role in "informing, educating and entertaining the public without ignoring financial and social obligations."

I am not sure what happened to the panel's somewhat confusing and contradictory recommendations. In any case, the public service mandate of Doordarshan, in particular, had already been eroded over the previous couple of decades with the growing emphasis on commercially sponsored programmes.

Yet, as the European Commission observed some time ago, "Public service broadcasting, although having a clear economic relevance, is not comparable to a public service in any other economic sector. There is no other service that at the same time has access to such a wide sector of the population, provides it with so much information and content, and by doing so conveys and influences both individual and public opinion."

Clearly decisions about the content of public service broadcasting ought not to be made on the basis of commercial considerations alone. But our parliamentarians evidently thought otherwise. By the way, it is important to note that, although Prasar Bharati – which came into being through an Act of Parliament in 1997 – is supposed to be autonomous, the committee referred to it in 2005 as a "government channel."

Of course PSBs are under pressure in most parts of the world, with even the best-known of them all, the BBC, not being spared. But I remain convinced that public service broadcasting is an essential component of the media environment, especially in a country like ours. And I am not entirely alone in what may appear to be support for a lost cause.

According to a report prepared for the European Commission in 2009,[1] the co-existence of media with different mandates and sources of financing – notably commercial media, public service media and community or alternative media – within and across media sectors such as print, television, radio and the Internet, is an essential element of media pluralism which, in turn, is a crucial aspect of freedom of expression and the rights to information and communication. Clearly, if media pluralism is to be assured, the baby of public service media

---

[1] Final Report of Independent Study on Indicators for Media Pluralism in the Member States: Towards a Risk-Based Approach, K.U. Leuven (ICRI), Jönköping International Business School – MMTC, Central European University – CMCS, Ernst & Young Consultancy – Belgium, July 2009

cannot be thrown out with the bathwater of political interference. Equally, the fledgling community media sector needs to be nurtured, not shackled, in the interest of media pluralism.

I think it is fairly evident that the proliferation of private Indian television channels – 832, according to mid-2015 figures, nearly half of them news channels – has not resulted in better, more varied programming catering to diverse communities and interests, including women and their priorities and concerns.

This is at least partly because the emergence and growth of private television in India has been almost completely unregulated. I am by no means suggesting that private sector broadcasting – or, indeed, any form of media – should be government-controlled. But in no mature democracy anywhere in the world is there no regulation of such an important industry. In any case, does no one remember the landmark 1995 judgment of the Supreme Court of India in a case with the rather misleading title: The Secretary, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting vs. Cricket Association of Bengal?

The apex Court held that the airwaves or frequencies were a public property and that their use had to be controlled and regulated by a public authority in the interests of the public and to prevent the invasion of their rights. The Court also held that the right to impart and receive information is a species of the right to freedom. It stated that a diversity of opinions, views and ideas cannot be provided by a medium controlled by a monopoly – whether the monopoly is of the State or any other individual, group or organisation. It went even further and said in what now appears to be a remarkably prescient observation, "As a matter of fact, private broadcasting stations may perhaps be more prejudicial to the free speech right of citizens than government-controlled media, as explained in the body of the judgment. The broadcasting media should be under the control of the public as distinct from the Government. This is the command implicit in Article 19 (1) (a)."

The Court actually instructed the Central Government in 1995 to take immediate steps to establish an independent, autonomous public authority, representative of all sections and interests in society, to control and regulate the use of the airwaves. Twenty one years later no such authority exists – I often wonder if the failure of successive governments to act upon the Court's orders cannot be challenged as contempt of court.

Meanwhile, the Telecom Regulatory Authority of India (or TRAI), which occasionally looks into media issues as well, released its *Recommendations on Issues Relating to Media Ownership* in August 2014. Few Indians, even among the newspaper-reading, television news-watching sections of the population, are likely to have heard of the document since it was more or less ignored by much of the Indian news media. The media's continuing lack of interest in an official

document on a critical issue of direct relevance to the industry is significant – I haven't found any updates on the subject. Perhaps this graphic, which can be found on newslaundry.com,[2] along with ownership details of 10 major media houses, besides Newslaundry itself, can help explain their reluctance to stir up the hornet's nest.

Media freedom and gender equality

I would now like to shift focus a bit by sharing some information and insights I have gained in the process of work over the past few years, which highlight the close links between freedom of expression – of which media freedom, independence and pluralism are essential parts – and gender equality and balance in the media.

The Platform for Action emerging from the United Nations Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing (BPfA) in 1995 was, of course, the first official document to highlight the critical importance of media in the attainment of gender equality and women's empowerment. The last-minute addition of Section J of the BPfA focused attention on Women and Media as one of the 12 critical areas of concern for the advancement and empowerment of women. It stressed the need to "increase the participation and access of women to expression and decision-making in and through the media as well as new technologies of communication," and "promote balanced and non-stereotyped portrayal of women in the media."

But I think I can safely say that 2002 was a watershed year in terms of joining the dots linking media freedom and gender equality. The Media Institute of Southern Africa (MISA) was a front-runner among freedom of expression organisations when its 2002 gender policy explicitly stated that "gender equality is intrinsic to a pluralistic and diverse media."[i]

Also in 2002 a UN Expert Group Meeting (EGM) on women's participation in and access to the media, which I participated in, highlighted the fact that the status of women and the status of the media are both key indices of the development and democratisation of a society.[ii] As the report of the meeting (written by Margaret Gallagher and myself) pointed out, the media – in all their forms – are central to women's advancement and empowerment. Women's right to freedom of expression and to information, which includes their right to speak and be heard, as well as their right to enter and participate in media professions, are fundamental to the realisation of all their rights and freedoms. Participants in the EGM called for the convergence of debates about women's rights and about communication systems so that women's concerns about their access to media and their right to freedom of expression and communication are taken into account in discussions on matters relating to the freedom, ownership and control,

---

[2] http://www.newslaundry.com/2014/02/05/who-owns-your-media-4/

and structures of the media. The key outcomes and recommendations emerging from the EGM were presented at the 47th Session of the UN Commission on the Status of Women in 2003.

More recently, and significantly, the UN Special Rapporteur on the Promotion and Protection of the Rights to Freedom of Opinion and Expression has weighed in on the subject.

"The undeniable link between freedom of expression and women's human rights, which include the right to express their opinions, to have access to their own means of communication and to work in the existing mass media" was recalled by the 2010 Report of the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Promotion and Protection of the Rights to Freedom of Opinion and Expression.[iii]

"Equal enjoyment of the right to freedom of expression remains elusive and historically disadvantaged groups – including women, minorities, refugees, indigenous peoples and sexual minorities – continue to struggle to have their voices heard and to access information of relevance to them," observed the tenth anniversary joint declaration on "Ten key challenges to freedom of expression in the next decade" issued by the UN Special Rapporteur, together with colleagues from other parts of the world, in February 2010.[iv]

Among the areas of special concern listed in the declaration were the lack of adequate self-regulatory measures to address the under-representation of historically disadvantaged groups among mainstream media workers, including in the public media; the inadequate coverage by the media and others of issues of relevance to such groups; and the prevalence of stereotypical or derogatory information about these groups in the media.

So it is increasingly acknowledged across the world that, in order to enjoy freedom of expression, human rights and gender equality, people – including women, men and members of sexual minorities – must be equally able to participate in the media (in multiple roles and at multiple levels), express themselves through the media, and determine the nature and content of the media. In other words, women and media, gender and media are no longer niche issues, but centrally connected to human rights and fundamental freedoms.

The importance of media pluralism

It was while preparing a background paper for the 2014 UNESCO report on World Trends in Freedom of Expression and Media Development that I realised that gender equality in the media is intimately linked to media pluralism – even more than it is to media freedom and independence.

Media pluralism was traditionally equated with "the existence of the greatest possible number of newspapers, magazines and periodicals reflecting the widest possible range of opinion within the community" and "the end of monopolies of any kind."[v] A more recent working definition describes it as "the scope for a wide range of social, political and cultural values, opinions, information and interests to find expression through the media."[vi] So diversity is clearly an integral element of media pluralism, with newer, broader interpretations of pluralism highlighting the imperatives of diversity in general and inclusiveness in particular.

The 2009 report to the European Commission mentioned earlier, which presented a Media Pluralism Monitor designed to detect potential risks to media pluralism in member states of the European Union, identified five dimensions of media pluralism (referred to as risk domains). Pluralism of media ownership and control is only one of them. The others are: cultural pluralism, political pluralism, geographic/local pluralism and pluralism of media types and genres.

The indicators – essentially, sets of identified threats to pluralism – are categorised into three groups: legal, economic and socio-demographic.

I found the document very interesting and illuminating, but I won't go into too many details here. Each dimension of media pluralism identified in the document is significant in the Indian context. But I will just refer to cultural pluralism and a few of the socio-demographic indicators related to that.

Cultural pluralism, as described in the document, refers to the fair and diverse representation of and expression in the media by various cultural and social groups, including ethnic, linguistic, national and religious minorities, disabled people, women and sexual minorities. It involves, among other things, the presence of a plurality of themes and voices, and the representation of diverse values, viewpoints and roles, in the media, thanks to which citizens belonging to different cultural and social groups, such as those mentioned earlier, can recognise themselves in the media.[vii]

I will highlight just a few of the socio-demographic indicators for (or threats to) cultural pluralism, selected for their reference to women/gender, among other factors and identities:

- "Absent or insufficient media representation of particular cultural, religious, linguistic, and ethnic groupings in society, including communities based on gender, age, disabilities and sexual orientation"

- "Stereotypical, unfair or discriminatory media portrayal" of such groupings and communities.

- "Absence or insufficient representation of journalists and media executives from minority, ethnic, religious, linguistic groups in society, including women, disabled people and sexual minorities."

- "Absence or insufficient representation of particular cultural, religious, linguistic, ethnic groupings in society, including communities based on gender, sexual orientation, age and disabilities, in the programmes of public service media as well as in their workforce and governing bodies."

Media pluralism is intrinsically about enabling the presence of a range of voices, values and perspectives in the media and thereby facilitating inclusive public debate, generating open discussion between various sub-groups and systems within a society, and reflecting diverse interests and concerns. This is of crucial importance because "a society's most inclusive conversations with itself are conducted through the media. If those media do not reflect society in all its facets, all its complexity, that conversation becomes distorted and simplistic in ways that nourish intolerance."[viii]

As another recent, official document relating to media pluralism in Europe puts it, "If media freedom provides the possibility to express oneself and to access information, then media pluralism is the degree of outreach of this freedom – i.e., the outcome being that every group in a society can enjoy this freedom."[ix]

A substantial body of research evidently establishes the under-representation of minorities, ethnic and religious groups, women and the disabled in the media content and services broadly available to the public in Europe. The first obstacle to ascertaining the situation in India is the relative absence of such research.

Gender balance is an obvious prerequisite for pluralistic media reflecting the diversity of any given population. Fortunately, some systematically gathered data is available on women's presence in the Indian media workforce as well as the representation of women in Indian media content as sources of news, information and opinion.

Women in the news

The *Global Media Monitoring Project (GMMP)*[x] is the world's longest-running and most extensive research on gender in news media, conducted every five years since 1995.[3] While the

---

[3] *http://whomakesthenews.org/gmmp/gmmp-reports/gmmp-2015-reports*,

http://cdn.agilitycms.com/who-makes-the-news/Imported/reports_2015/global/gmmp_global_report_en.pdf

2010 edition covered 108 countries across the world, including India,[xi] the latest covered 114 countries. The global report of GMMP 2015 was launched last November. Unfortunately, this time the India Country Report has been delayed because of some unfortunate but unavoidable circumstances but we hope it will be available within a month. What is very disturbing is that after excruciatingly slow but nonetheless steady progress in the representation of women in the news in the 15 years since 1995, there has evidently been stagnation and even backsliding over the past five years. I will just quickly take you through the main findings in 2015. Please note that the monitoring exercise in India in 2015 covered only print, TV and Internet news (not radio or Twitter).

▶ Women made up only a quarter (24%) of the persons heard, read about or seen in newspaper, television and radio news in 2015, exactly as they did in 2010: NO IMPROVEMENT in the past 5 years.

▶ The overall presence of women in the Indian news media in 2015 (print and television – we were unable to monitor radio this time) was 21%: lower than the global average and lower than the 2010 figure (22%). Actually, radio may have further lowered the Indian average down since in 2010 women constituted only 13% of the subjects of news bulletins on AIR, considerably less than in print and television news.

▶ Women's relative invisibility in traditional news media has crossed over into digital news delivery platforms: In 2015 only 26% of the people in Internet news stories and media news Tweets combined are women. At 36%, women appear to be better represented in Indian news websites (i.e. Internet news) than in traditional media but this figure does not include Tweets.

▶ Across the six GMMP function types (roles in which people appear in the news), the largest stride in closing the gender gap was in people interviewed based on personal experience. Women now comprise 38% of personal experience providers, compared to 31% in 2005. However, less than a fifth (19%) of experts featured in the news in 2015 was female - an insignificant two percentage point increase in a decade. Similarly, only a fifth (20%) of persons interviewed as spokespersons were women in 2015.

▶ Only 12% of experts and commentators were women in the Indian news media (print and television – no radio), down from 18% in 2010.

▶ Progress towards news representation that acknowledges women's participation in economic life remained elusive at the global level in 2015. In the 2015 news world, only 20% of the total workers in the formal labour force were women, while 67% of the unemployed and stay-at-home parents were women (even though in reality women

hold approximately 40% of paid employment globally and an even larger proportion of women work in the informal sector, particularly in the Global South).

▶ Selection of news sources draws on a narrow range of people, with considerable gender-stereotyping as well. Female personal experience providers are most likely to be portrayed as parents/homemakers (13%), female eyewitness account givers are most often portrayed as simply residents/villagers (22%), and female popular opinion providers are most likely to be described as students (17%).

▶ In 2015 only 10% of news stories focused on women. This is lower than the figure in 2010, which was 13%. The proportion in 2015 reverts to the level recorded in 2000 and 2005. The least likely categories of news likely to focus on women are: economic news followed by political news - currently at 5% and 7% of stories respectively.

▶ At 11% India had more stories with women as the central focus than the global average but this represents a drop from 12% in 2010. Also, most of these stories were about crime and violence: 40% of crime stories had women as the central focus. In contrast, women were the central focus in just 6% of stories on the economy – down from 10% in 2010.

▶ Only 9% of stories in 2015 evoked gender (in)equality issues. The good news is that this is more than double the percentage documented 10 years ago: the percentage of stories in which gender equality or inequality issues are raised has been rising steadily since 2005. The bad news is that it remains below the 10% mark.

▶ Few stories in the Indian print and television media raised issues of gender equality/inequality. Of those that did raise it, 32% were on the legal system/judiciary/legislation, 9% each on violent crime, gender violence based on culture and celebrity news, and 6% on education and literacy.

▶ Gender stereotypes have remained firmly embedded in news media output over the past decade. In 2015 only 4% of stories clearly challenged gender stereotypes – this represents just a one percentage point increase in the decade since 2005. The proportion is the same in online news as in print and broadcast.

Clearly, despite the recognition several decades ago that women hold up half the sky,[xii] according to currently available data they constitute only a quarter of the voices represented in the news media.

Women in newsrooms

Another socio-demographic indicator for cultural pluralism relates to representation in media professions.

According to the High Level Group on Media Freedom and Pluralism in Europe, "The journalistic profession should … reflect the diversity in the general population and media outlets must be encouraged to reflect the diversity of the population in their newsroom and on-screen."[xiii]

Some relatively recent, reliable and relevant data is available on women's presence and position in Indian newsrooms. Popular perceptions and depictions of the preponderance of women in present-day media are, unfortunately, not borne out by statistics. The 2011 *Global Report on the Status of Women in the News Media*,[xiv] covering over 500 media companies in nearly 60 countries, revealed that, despite the growing and visible presence of many successful, high profile and highly regarded media women, both internationally and in India, the overall situation is far from encouraging in most parts of the world. Again, I will just quickly present some of the main findings of the 2011 study.

Men outnumber women by 4:1 among all employees (journalists and other categories) of the surveyed news companies in India.[xv] Globally, women comprise about one third of the total media workforce.[xvi] Less than a quarter (23.5%) of Indian journalists is female.[xvii] The corresponding global figure is around a third (36%). Women make up approximately one fifth (21%) of the governance structures of the Indian news companies surveyed (as members of company boards of directors, for instance). It must be noted that the governance figure for India does not necessarily indicate professional upward mobility since many women here join governing boards as members of proprietorial families rather than on the basis of merit, qualifications or experience (exceptions notwithstanding). The corresponding figure across the globe is 25.9% or a little over a quarter.

Less than 14% of the top management level (publishers, CEOs and others in charge of running media companies) comprises women. That is about half the global average of 27.3%. Less than a quarter (23.3%) of the positions in senior management (news directors, editors-in-chief and so on) is occupied by women. The corresponding global figure is 38.7% or well over a third. Women constitute no more than 28% (between a quarter and a third) in any of the occupational categories and levels of the companies surveyed. The global situation is markedly better (though still not balanced), with women comprising 41% of senior professionals, 38.7% of senior management and 36.1% of junior professionals.

At another level, a year-long study by the New Delhi-based Media Studies Group India[xviii] found that female journalists represent a tiny 2.7% of the total number of journalists at the district

level.[xix] This survey covered 14,278 accredited journalists working in 255 districts of 28 states (approximately 40% of the total number of districts in the country). Six states and two union territories were found to have no district-level accredited women journalists at all.

Another study conducted by the same group in 2006 also generated some telling findings.[xx] The survey, which examined the social background of 315 senior journalists in 37 Hindi and English newspapers and television channels in Delhi, revealed that the country's "national" media do not reflect the diversity of the population (to put it mildly).[xxi] According to the researchers, "Hindu upper caste men" — who constitute just eight per cent of the country's population — hold 71% of the top jobs in the "mainstream" media. Women, non-upper castes and Muslims were found to be grossly under-represented, with women comprising a low 17% of "key decision-makers." The study found that women's representation in top editorial positions was best in the English language electronic media (32%) and worst in the Hindi electronic media (11%). Corresponding figures for the print media were 16% (English) and 14% (Hindi). Social groups with the "double disadvantage" of gender and class, caste or religion were barely represented in the higher echelons of the news media.

A 2014 survey which examined the Delhi editions of four leading newspapers over three months revealed that 73 per cent of the 8,681 articles in the sample were written by men, while women contributed to just 27 per cent of the articles.[4] In other words, for every one article written by a woman, there were about three pieces written by men. Significantly, male bylines dominated both the front page and the editorial/op-ed pages of all the papers.

Women in public sector media

Another socio-economic indicator for cultural pluralism in the media relates to public service media. Figures pertaining to women's presence in the country's state/public broadcaster are quite discouraging. The last chairperson of Prasar Bharati was a woman (and a distinguished editor and writer), but the 13-member board presided over by the first-ever female PB chairperson till April 2014 included only one other woman – and she was a politician, not a media person.[xxii] When I last checked, the named members of the new board listed on the Prasar Bharati website were all male, including the chairperson and the chief executive officer (four part-time member positions appeared to be vacant).[xxiii]

Both Doordarshan (DD) and All India Radio (AIR) had female Directors General a few years into the new millennium, both appointed in 2009 after decades of male leadership. Of them one

---

[4] http://www.newslaundry.com/2014/12/05/where-are-the-women/?ref=art_sidebar_banner

was a career broadcaster who joined the radio network as a programme executive, worked her way up over 25 years, and retired in 2011 after two years as DG, AIR.

However, this does not alter the fact that there are few women in senior jobs in AIR. Of the 14 posts in senior programme management in 2012, only four (28%) were held by women.[xxiv] In 2015, of the 11 names listed under senior programme management, only three (27%) were women.[xxv] Of the 19 senior management posts in engineering, none identified by name were women in 2012.[xxvi] In 2015, only 13 of the 19 were identified by name and just one of them was a woman (less than 8%).[xxvii] Of the 47 senior administrative posts, 18 (38%) were held by women in 2012, one of them holding two posts.[xxviii] By 2015, the number of senior administrative personnel had grown to 60 but only 11 of them (18%) were women.[xxix]

Employment figures obtained directly from Prasar Bharati in 2012 revealed that women constituted only 10% of the total of 34,143 employees in DD and AIR taken together (in news and non-news positions), and that the 10% limit held for the two organisations separately, too.[xxx]

Women in media regulatory bodies

Among the the High Level Committee's recommendations to the European Commission on media pluralism was this one: "All EU countries should have independent media councils with a politically and culturally balanced and socially diverse membership."[xxxi] In this context it is worth noting that there is a gender deficit in India's existing media regulatory bodies (official and otherwise) as well.

In 2012 the chairperson of the Press Council of India was a man and, of the 27 members of the Council, only one was a woman, and she was a member of parliament, not a media professional. Members of the subsequent, 12th term of the Council were appointed in October 2014. The chairperson is a man, yet again, and only two of the 28 members are women: one journalist and one member of parliament.[xxxii]

In 2012 the Telecom Regulatory Authority of India (TRAI), which has jurisdiction over the telecommunications as well as broadcasting industries, had five members – all male. In 2015 the organisational structure posted on its website included only three named individuals – two men (the chairperson and the secretary) and one woman (the sole member, with the three other members' positions evidently vacant).[xxxiii]

In 2012 the News Broadcasters Association, a self-regulatory body comprising some of the leading private television news companies, had eight directors on the board, of whom only one was a woman. In 2015 there were nine directors on the NBA board, two of them women.

Although the NBA has had a female secretary general for several years, the rest of the secretariat appear to be entirely male.[xxxiv]

Clearly cultural pluralism in the media cannot be taken for granted despite the cultural diversity for which the country is known and widely celebrated.

Women and media ownership

It is widely recognised that ownership and control are critical aspects of media pluralism and concentration of media ownership is generally acknowledged as a threat to pluralism, allowing for the "disproportionate influence of one or few economic, social and/or political powers."[xxxv] However, the fact that gender and power are closely linked and that lopsided gender representation can result in such disproportionate influence is rarely factored into discussions on media pluralism.

The current paucity of gender-disaggregated data on media ownership – in most parts of the world – reflects the limited understanding of pluralism that has prevailed so far. But the scarce information that does exist, together with the considerable available evidence of the under-representation of women in media professions (particularly in governance and decision-making positions within both management and editorial structures), suggests that they are unlikely to be well-represented among owners.[xxxvi] In India, of course, attempts to unravel the complex systems and structures of media ownership, especially in the private sector, are only beginning to yield some preliminary information and it will probably be some time before a gender analysis of media ownership patterns is feasible.

Women in online news media

At another level, there is widespread acceptance of the idea that the rapidly evolving media and information environment, facilitated by the apparently incessant innovations in ICTs over the past couple of decades, has significantly democratised the media space. Many believe that the Internet and digital technology have breached the boundaries of availability and access to such an extent that media pluralism is no longer as vital an issue as it once was or, at least, that it is pertinent only to the "old" media, which are no longer central in the present scheme of things. "New" media enthusiasts point out that the abundance and ascendancy of bloggers, citizen journalists and social networkers have narrowed, if not eliminated, the gap between professional journalists and others using interactive, participatory new media to express themselves, report events, analyse issues and exchange views.

However, several experts are evidently not convinced that the technological and socio-cultural changes in the contemporary media environment have actually led to real diversity and a

meaningful plurality of voices. They acknowledge that some of the new communication technologies can and do support more diversity and pluralism than others but suggest that it is unwise, if not naïve, to assume that the Internet and other technological advances will automatically eliminate problems related to media pluralism. According to them, the indisputable increase in new media does not guarantee pluralism, and "communicative abundance" alone does not make questions about the distribution of communicative power and political voice obsolete – it merely reconfigures them in a more complex form. They point out that disparities in the opportunities offered by new media largely reflect previously recognised socio-economic inequalities.[xxxvii]

From a gender diversity standpoint, the latter stance makes sense, especially in view of continuing gender-based differences in access to information and communication technologies in many parts of the world.[xxxviii] Besides the issue of access, which is of course critical in countries like India, there are questions about the nature and perceptions of women's use of new media. While the gender gap among bloggers appears to be reducing at the global level, there seems to be a persistent gender divergence in terms of the topics covered by male and female writers even in the new media.[xxxix] And, although several studies have established women's substantial and active presence in social networks (outnumbering men in most such networks) across the world,[xl] perceptions of the relative importance of male and female social networkers appear to vary, with leading publications evidently not taking women's activities as seriously as those of men.[xli]

And as mentioned earlier, the findings of the GMMP suggest that the under-representation of women in traditional news media has been carried over into the virtual news world, barring a few honourable exceptions.[xlii]

Beyond the issue of representation among users and sources, there are growing concerns about new hierarchies of power and forms of concentration that are specific to the new media. Several critics call attention to the fact that, despite all the diversity, plenitude and complexity, concerns about concentration of power and homogenisation of content have not actually disappeared. According to them, even if in principle the Internet provides an almost infinite diversity of voices and greatly expands the number of information sources, in practice the structure of the medium tends to create a high degree of concentration of content among a small handful of sites.[xliii] For example, in 2015, of the top dozen online news sites accessed by Indians – identified by web analytics company Alexa, on the basis of traffic estimates – two thirds belonged to existing mainstream print and/or broadcast news media organisations.[xliv] Few were stand-alone Internet sources. This is more or less the situation globally as well.[xlv]

According to an independent policy report commissioned by the European Union, "It is a fact that while the new technologies lower the entry barriers, thus facilitating the entry of new players, their real impact on media pluralism is still questionable."[xlvi] This does not mean that the democratic potential of the Internet and the many opportunities it offers can or should be discounted, let alone dismissed. However, it is clearly important to examine closely what the Internet means for media pluralism and how the latter can be protected and promoted through the former. This appears to be a crucial issue to scrutinise through a gender lens, too.

And then, of course, there is the contentious issue of online abuse and hate speech, which is emerging as a new form of gender violence, with women (including women journalists, bloggers, etc.) being particularly vulnerable to direct and indirect threats of sexual and other forms of violence. This is something the Ethical Journalism Network, among others, have recently called attention to.

Civil society and the media

I would like to end by calling attention to one of my long-standing bugbears: the fact that civil society in India, including women's groups and movements, which is extremely active, visible and vocal on a range of important issues, pays very little attention to the media – except in terms of whining and complaining about the media's sins of commission and omission and/or lobbying and cultivating the media (or at least individual journalists) to get stories covered (with the focus often more on the organisation's activities than the issue itself). And this is despite the Supreme Court having highlighted (over two decades ago) the fact that the airwaves constitute a public asset, to be used for the public good.

The lack of serious interest in the media, despite its ever-expanding and influential role in both public and private life, is evidently not just a problem restricted to India.

According to a colleague from Mexico, the Media Compact announced by UNWomen at the March 2016 meeting of the Commission on the Status of Women in New York provides an example of how little thought is given to such media-related initiatives. The Step it Up for Gender Equality Media Compact reportedly brings together "a broad coalition of media outlets from every region who work in print, broadcast and online news media to ensure wide reach and robust efforts towards women's rights and gender equality." It will apparently function as an alliance of media organisations that are committed to playing an active role in advancing gender issues within the framework of the Sustainable Development Goals.

The Mexican media company selected for this alliance is TV Azteca. According to my media scholar friend, its owner is involved in the ongoing Panama Papers scandal. He was also one of the main opponents to the new Broadcasting and Telecommunications legislation in the

country (presumably because it would harm his financial interests). To make matters worse, TV Azteca content is apparently known to promote sexist stereotypes and violence against women. I gather that civil society in Mexico has strongly opposed the inclusion of TV Azteca in the Compact. They suspect the proprietor and management will merely use the global connection and the gender equality agenda as means to gain social legitimacy without any real commitment to the issue. Incidentally, no Indian media company appears to be part of the alliance; the Delhi-based Women's Features Service seems to be the only alliance partner in the country.

I would like to close with two quotes which clearly state why it is important for all those concerned about gender equality and justice to continue to focus on gender and the media.

▸ "Institutions that are not changed cannot become agents of change. Just as gender has to be mainstreamed in government it has to be mainstreamed in the media."

Editorial in daily paper brought out by gender/media activists during the Beijing Plus Ten review meeting at the UN, New York, March 2005

▸ "What, in the end, could be more central to free speech than that every segment of society should have a voice?"

Justice Athalia Molokomme *(Attorney General, Botswana)*

▸ "When every voice counts we can stop counting the voices."

Colleen Lowe Morna *(Chief Executive Officer, Gender Links, South Africa)*

Thank you.

Ammu Joseph

Journalist and author

13 May 2014

.

[i] Better Late Than Never? Audit of the Southern African Declaration on Gender and Development. Gender and the Media, Gender Links, MISA and GEMSA, *2005* (http://preditor.genderlinks.org.za/assets/articles/attachments/09290_audit_2005_-_communication-media.pdf, accessed April 2013, Page 16)

[ii] UN Expert Group Meeting on the "Participation and access of women to the media, and the impact of media on and its use as an instrument for the advancement and empowerment of women," Beirut, November 2002 (http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/egm/media2002/, accessed 12 February 2015)

[iii] Report of the Special Rapporteur on the promotion and protection of the right to freedom of opinion and expression, Mr. Frank La Rue, 20 April 2010 (http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G10/130/49/PDF/G1013049.pdf?OpenElement, accessed 25 October 2014)

iv Tenth anniversary joint declaration: Ten key challenges to freedom of expression in the next decade, The UN Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Opinion and Expression, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) Representative on Freedom of the Media, the Organization of American States (OAS) Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Expression, and the African Commission on Human and Peoples' Rights (ACHPR) Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Expression and Access to Information, 3 February 2010 (http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/G10/125/34/PDF/G1012534.pdf?OpenElement, accessed 25 October 2014)

v Declaration of Windhoek, 3 May 1991

vi Final Report of Independent Study on Indicators for Media Pluralism in the Member States: Towards a Risk-Based Approach, K.U. Leuven (ICRI), Jönköping International Business School – MMTC, Central European University – CMCS, Ernst & Young Consultancy – Belgium, July 2009

vii Ibid

viii Protecting Media Pluralism In Europe, Mark Thompson, Open Society Foundations, 18 December 2012 (http://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/voices/protecting-media-pluralism-europe, accessed 6 May 2015)

ix European Union Competencies in Respect of Media Pluralism and Media Freedom - Policy Report, Centre for Media Pluralism and Media Freedom, January 2013 (https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/sites/digital-agenda/files/CMPFPolicyReport2013.pdf, accessed April 2013)

x Who Makes the News? Global Media Monitoring Project 2010, World Association for Christian Communication (2010a), September 2010, (http://whomakesthenews.org/images/stories/website/gmmp_reports/2010/global/gmmp_global_report_en.pdf, accessed April 2013)

xi The GMMP's India data is based on the monitoring of a sample comprising 20 daily newspapers, 11 TV news bulletins and 5 radio bulletins (AIR) in 9 languages. The global, regional and national reports of the GMMP 2010 are available here: http://www.whomakesthenews.org/gmmp-2010-reports.html, accessed 5 May 2015.

xii Reference to Chinese leader Mao Zedong's famous proclamation, "Women hold up half the sky."

xiii A free and pluralistic media to sustain European democracy: Report of the High Level Group on Media Freedom and Pluralism (commissioned by European Commission), Vaira Vīķe-Freiberga (Chair), Herta Däubler-Gmelin, Ben Hammersley, Luís Miguel Poiares Pessoa Maduro, January 2013 (http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/sites/digital-agenda/files/HLG%20Final%20Report.pdf, accessed April 2013)

xiv Global Report on the Status of Women in News Media, Carolyn M. Byerly, International Women's Media Foundation, Washington, 2011 (http://iwmf.org/pdfs/IWMF-Global-Report-Summary.pdf, accessed April 2013)

xv 17 Indian news companies – 10 newspapers, 6 television channels and 1 radio station – located in 4 cities (Delhi, Mumbai, Chennai and Bangalore) and operating in 5 languages (English, Hindi, Marathi, Tamil and Kannada), were ultimately taken into account in the study (several others were surveyed but could not be included in the sample because they provided incomplete/insufficient information).

[xvi] The study covered 522 companies in 59 countries across seven regions (Mideast & North Africa, Subsaharan Africa, Americas, Asia and Oceana, Eastern Europe, Nordic Europe and Western Europe).

[xvii] This figure was arrived at by averaging the statistics for workers in the following four journalistic categories of the study on which the Global Report is based: senior management, middle management, senior level and junior level professions

[xviii] "Women journos number just 2.7% at district level, says survey," Hindustan Times, 5 May 2012 (http://www.hindustantimes.com/India-news/NewDelhi/Women-journos-number-just-2-7-at-district-level-says-survey/Article1-851294.aspx); "Conspicuous by her absence," Mohammad Ali, The Hindu, 14 May 2012 (http://www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/tp-features/article3416531.ece?css=print), "Women's participation in Indian news media 2.7%," Media Studies Group India (http://mediastudiesgroup.org.in/research/survey/survey_detail.aspx?TID=1)

[xix] The study covered 14,278 accredited journalists working in 255 districts of 28 states (i.e., approximately 40% of the total number of districts in the country)

[xx] "Survey of the Social Profile of Key Decision Makers in the National Media," Anil Chamaria, Jitendra Kumar, Yogendra Yadav, Media Studies Group India, 2006 (http://osdir.com/ml/culture.india.sarai.reader/2006-06/msg00043.html; http://www.hindu.com/2006/06/05/stories/2006060504981400.htm)

[xxi] The study examined the social background of 315 senior journalists in 37 Hindi and English newspapers and television channels in Delhi.

[xxii] Website of Prasar Bharati (http://prasarbharati.gov.in/Corporate/pb+board), accessed 3 November 2012)

[xxiii] Website of Prasar Bharati (http://prasarbharati.gov.in/Corporate/PB%20Board/Pages/default.aspx), accessed 3 May 2015.

[xxiv] Website of All India Radio (http://allindiaradio.gov.in/NR/rdonlyres/8FA4994C-DEB7-4B50-97DA-FB8072405840/374095/programme.htm, accessed September 2012)

[xxv] Website of All India Radio (http://allindiaradio.gov.in/WhoisWho/Pages/ProgrammeSeniorManagement.aspx), accessed on 5 May 2015.

[xxvi] Website of All India Radio (http://allindiaradio.gov.in/NR/rdonlyres/8FA4994C-DEB7-4B50-97DA-FB8072405840/374074/smengg.htm, accessed September 2012)

[xxvii] Website of All India Radio (http://allindiaradio.gov.in/WhoisWho/Pages/SeniorEngineeringManagement.aspx), accessed 5 May 2015.

[xxviii] Website of All India Radio (http://allindiaradio.gov.in/NR/rdonlyres/8FA4994C-DEB7-4B50-97DA-FB8072405840/373797/Admin.htm, accessed September 2012)

[xxix] Website of All India Radio (http://allindiaradio.gov.in/Oppurtunities/Tenders/Documents/admin%2027022015.pdf), accessed on 5 May 2015.

xxx Received via personal communication with Ms. Mrinal Pande (then Chairperson, Prasar Bharati) and Brig. (Retd.) V.A.M. Hussain (Member - Personnel, Prasar Bharati) in September-October 2012

xxxi A free and pluralistic media to sustain European democracy: Report of the High Level Group on Media Freedom and Pluralism (commissioned by European Commission), Vaira Vīķe-Freiberga (Chair), Herta Däubler-Gmelin, Ben Hammersley, Luís Miguel Poiares Pessoa Maduro, January 2013 (http://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/sites/digital-agenda/files/HLG%20Final%20Report.pdf, accessed April 2013)

xxxii Website of the Press Council of India (http://presscouncil.nic.in/, accessed September 2012 and March 2015)

xxxiii Website of the Telecom Regulatory Authority of India (http://www.trai.gov.in/Content/Authority.aspx, accessed September 2012 and March 2015)

xxxiv Website of the News Broadcasters Association (http://www.nbanewdelhi.com/Board-directors.asp, accessed September 2012 and March 2015)

xxxv *European Union Competencies in Respect of Media Pluralism and Media Freedom* - Policy Report, Centre for Media Pluralism and Media Freedom, January 2013 (https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/sites/digital-agenda/files/CMPFPolicyReport2013.pdf), accessed November 2013.

xxxvi The United States Federal Communications Commission's November 2012 Report on Ownership of Commercial Broadcast Stations (http://www.fcc.gov/document/report-ownership-commercial-broadcast-stations) provides a rare glimpse of the gendered nature of media ownership. It revealed that women presently own majority interest in very few US broadcast stations: 6.8% of full-powered TV stations, 7.8% of AM radio stations and 5.8% of FM radio stations; they have made only small advances since 2006 – growing by 2% or less. With African Americans owning less than 3% (down from less than 5% in 2006) and Latinos owning less than 5% of any single broadcast medium, minority women are even less likely to be well represented among broadcast media owners in the US (See "Media Conglomeration is Women's Business: FCC Reports Female Broadcast Ownership Below 8%," Carolyn M. Byerly, *Media Report to Women,* Winter 2013).

xxxvii *Rethinking Media Pluralism and Communicative Abundance,* Kari Karppinen, Observatorio (OBS*) Journal 11, 2009 (available at http://obs.obercom.pt, accessed November 2013).

xxxviii *Gender Equity and the Media (with reference to HIV/AIDS),* Warren Feek, The Communication Initiative – paper presented at the 57th Session of the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women, New York, March 2013 (http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/csw/csw57/panels/panel4-warren-feek.pdf, accessed November 2013).

xxxix *State of the Blogosphere (2004-2011)*, Technorati (http://technorati.com/state-of-the-blogosphere/); *The Byline Survey Report, 2012: Who Narrates the World?*, Taryn Yaeger, *The Byline Blog*(http://theopedproject.wordpress.com/2012/05/28/the-byline-survey-2011/); *Sex & Power: Who Runs Britain?*, Centre for Women & Democracy/Counting Women In coalition, 2013 (http://www.countingwomenin.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/02/Sex-and-Power-2013-FINALv2.-pdf.pdf), all accessed November 2013.

xl *65% of online adults use social networking sites,* Mary Madden and Kathryn Zickuhr, Pew Research Center, Washington DC, 26 August 2011 (http://www.pewinternet.org/~/media/files/reports/2011/pip-sns-update-

2011.pdf); *Report: Social network demographics in 2012*, Pingdom (http://royal.pingdom.com/2012/08/21/report-social-network-demographics-in-2012/, accessed November 2013).

xli *New Media's Old Problem*, Natalie Kitroeff, *The New York Times* blog, 29 June 2012 (http://kristof.blogs.nytimes.com/2012/06/29/new-medias-old-problem/); *TIME's list of top Twitter users is basically a boys' club*, Meg Heckman, *A Site of Her Own*, 25 March 2014 (https://megheckman.wordpress.com/2013/03/25/times-list-of-top-twitter-users-is-basically-a-boys-club/); James Curran and Tamara Witschge 'Liberal Dreams and the Internet', pp. 102-118 in *New Media, Old News: Journalism & Democracy in the Digital Age,* edited by Natalie Fenton, London: Sage Publications 2009. The quote is on pp 111-112., all accessed November 2013).

xlii *Who Makes the News? Global Media Monitoring Project 2010,* World Association for Christian Communication (2010a), September 2010, (http://whomakesthenews.org/images/stories/website/gmmp_reports/2010/global/gmmp_global_report_en.pdf, accessed 4 May 2015)

xliii See, for example, *Rethinking Media Pluralism and Communicative Abundance*, Kari Karppinen, Observatorio (OBS*) Journal 11, 2009 (available at http://obs.obercom.pt) and statement by Anita Gurumurthy, IT for Change, at the closing ceremony of WSIS Plus 10 Review, UNESCO, 25-27 February, 2013 (http://www.itforchange.net/sites/default/files/ITfC/WSIS%20+%2010%20closing%20statement%20by%20Anita%20G.pdf, accessed April 2013)

xliv Top Online News sites in India, Alexa.com (http://www.alexa.com/topsites/category/Top/Regional/Asia/India/News_and_Media/Online_News, accessed 10 May 2015).

xlv Top news sites globally (http://www.alexa.com/topsites/category/Top/News, accessed 10 May 2015).

xlvi *European Union Competencies in Respect of Media Pluralism and Media Freedom* - Policy Report, Centre for Media Pluralism and Media Freedom, January 2013 (https://ec.europa.eu/digital-agenda/sites/digital-agenda/files/CMPFPolicyReport2013.pdf, accessed November 2013)