


I'm not robot  reCAPTCHA

Continue

The communication coding/decoding model was first developed by cultural scientist Stuart Hall in 1973. Titled Coding and Decoding in Television Discourse, Hall's essay offers a theoretical approach to how media reports are produced, distributed and interpreted. Hall suggested that viewers could play an active role in deciphering messages because they rely on their own social contexts, and can change messages themselves through collective action. Simply put, coding/decoding is a message translation that is easy to understand. When you decode a message, you extract the meaning of that message in a way that makes sense to you. Decoding has both verbal and non-verbal forms of communication: Decoding behavior without the use of words means observing body language and related emotions. For example, some signs of body language when someone is upset, angry, or stressed would use excessive hand movements/hands, red in the face, crying and sometimes silence. Sometimes, when someone tries to deliver a message to someone, the message can be interpreted differently from person to person. Decoding is all about understanding what someone already knows, based on the information given throughout the message received. Whether there is a large audience or sharing a message with one person, decryption is the process of receiving, absorbing, understanding, and sometimes using information that has been given in an oral or non-verbal communication. For example, because advertising can have multiple layers of meaning, they can be deciphered differently and can mean something different to different people. The level of connotation of the visual sign, its contextual reference and positioning in various discursive areas of meaning and association, is the point where already coded signs intersect with deep semantic cultural codes and take additional, more active ideological dimensions. - Stuart Hall, 1980, Coding/Deciphering. Determining message coding is the production of a message. This is a system of coded values, and in order to create this, the sender must understand how the world is understood by audience members. In the coding process, the sender (i.e. the coder) uses verbal (e.g. words, signs, images, videos) and nonverbal (e.g. body language, hand gestures, facial expressions) for which he or she believes that the recipient (i.e. decoder) will understand. Symbols can be words and numbers, images, facial expressions, signals and/or actions. It's very important how the message is encoded; this depends in part on the purpose of the message. Deciphering a message is how an audience member can understand and interpret a message. It's a process of interpretation and translation in an understandable way. The audience tries to reconstruct the idea by giving meaning to the symbols and interpreting the message as a whole. Effective communication is only possible when the message is received and understood in the intended way. However, the recipient of the message can still understand the message quite differently than what the coder was trying to convey. This is when distortions or misunderstandings arise due to the lack of equivalence between the two sides in the communication exchange. In his essay, Hall compares two patterns of communication. First, the traditional model is criticized for its linearity - sender/message/receiver - and for the lack of a structured concept of different points as a complex relationship structure. The author proposes the idea that the communication process is more widespread and thus puts forward a four-year model of communication, taking into account the production, distribution, use and reproduction of media reports. Unlike the traditional linear approach of the sender and recipient, it perceives each of these steps as autonomous and interdependent. Hall further explains that the values and messages in the discursive production are organized through the functioning of codes within the language rules. Each stage will affect the message (or product) transmitted as a result of its discursive form (e.g. practices, tools, relationships). Therefore, once the discourse is complete, it must be translated into social practice in order to be completed and effective - If you do not take meaning, there can be no consumption. Each of these steps helps to define the one that follows while remaining clearly different. Thus, while each of these moments (stages) is equally important to the process as a whole, they do not fully guarantee that the next moment will be necessary. Each can represent their own rupture or interruption of the passage of forms on which the flow of efficient production (i.e. reproduction) depends. These four stages: Manufacturing - This is where coding begins building a message. The production process has its own discursive aspect, as it is also framed by meanings and ideas; based on the dominant ideologies of society, the creator of the message feeds on the beliefs and values of society. Numerous factors are involved in the production process. On the one hand, knowledge in use, concerning production routine, technical skills, professional ideologies, institutional knowledge, definitions and assumptions, assumptions about audience form production structures of television. On the other hand, themes, procedures, agendas, events, personnel, audience images, definition of the situation from other sources other discursive formations form another part of the wider socio-cultural and political structure. Circulation - How people perceive things: visual versus writing. The way things are circulating affects how viewers get the message and get it used. According to Philip Elliott, the audience is both a source and a receiver of a television message. For example, the circulation and reception of media reports are incorporated into the production process through numerous feedback. Thus, circulation and perception, although not identical, are certainly related to and involved in the production process. Use (distribution or consumption) - In order for a message to be successfully implemented, broadcasting structures must receive coded messages in the form of meaningful discourse. This means that the message must be accepted as a meaningful discourse, and it must be essentially deciphered. However, deciphering/interpreting a message requires active recipients. Reproduction - This stage is immediately after the audience interpreted the message in their own way based on their experience and beliefs. Deciphered values are those with effect (e.g. influence, instruction, entertain) with very complex perceptions, cognitive, emotional, ideological or behavioral effects. What is done with the message after it has been interpreted is where this stage comes. At this point you will see whether people take action after they have been exposed to a particular message. Coding and deciphering broadcasting structures Since a discursive form plays such an important role in the communication process, Hall assumes that coding and decoding are defining moments. By this he means that an event, for example, cannot be transmitted in its raw format. A person must be physically at the scene of the event to see it in this format. Rather, he states that events can only be delivered to the audience in audiovisual forms of televisual discourse (i.e. the message moves on to production and distribution processes). This is when another defining moment begins - deciphering or interpreting images and messages across a wider social, cultural and political cognitive spectrum (i.e. consumption and reproduction processes). The event must become history before it can become a communicative event. - Stuart Hall, 1980, Coding/Deciphering Application Model This model has been adopted and applied by many media theorists since Hall developed it. Hall's work is central to the development of culture and continues today because of the importance of decoding. Cultural studies began to challenge the main media impact models in 1960. attention has focused on how viewers make sense and understand reality through their use of cultural both in print and in visual media. It is important to look at cultural research because his focus on the daily experience, looking at race, gender, class and sexuality all help bring meaning to the world we live in today. Theorists such as Dick Hebdidge, David Morley and Janice Redway are heavily influenced by Hall and have applied their theory to help develop their own: Hebdidge was a British cultural scholar and critic who studied under Hall at the Birmingham School of Cultural Studies. His model is based on Hall's idea of a subculture. He is best known for his influential book Subculture: The Meaning of Style, where he argues that the younger generation challenges dominant ideologies by developing different styles and practices that exhibit their separate identity and subversion. His study of punk subculture describes the potential causes and influences of the punk movement, especially for young people. His extensive study of subcultures and his resistance to mainstream society have shown that punk subcultures have used commodification to differentiate themselves from the mainstream or become mainstream. Hebdidge believed that punk was included in the media in an attempt to classify it in society, and he was critical of the issue by applying Hall's theory of coding and decoding. David Morley is a sociologist who studies the sociology of television audiences. Known as a key researcher in a nationwide project in the late 1970s, Morley picked up this popular news programme that aired daily on the BBC. It reported on national news from London and the main events of the day, and aired across the UK. He applied Hall's acceptance theory to study the coding/decoding model of this news program. The study focused on how the programme was addressed to the viewer and on the ideological themes it presented. Morley then took it one step further and conducted a qualitative study that included people with different social backgrounds. This is where Hall's research came into play. He wanted to see how they would react to some of the program's clips, based on three methods of decoding Hall: dominant/hegemonic, concerted or oppositional. Janice Redway, an American scholar in literature and culture, conducted a study on women in terms of romantic reading. In his book Reading Romance: Women, Patriarchy and Folk Literature, Radway studied a group of Midwestern women who were fans of novels. She argued that this cultural activity functioned as a personal time for women, who usually had no personal time for themselves. Although her work has not been noticed scientifically, and her study applied only to a small group of women, she was interested in interpreting how women can relate their daily lives to an art book. As a result, her study found that these studies determine in a very broad sense, because after all culture is made up of symbols of expression that society uses to understand everyday life. The Radway Audience Study worked out Hall's coding/decoding theory. Studying how specific people receive and interpret messages based on their background was something that played a huge role in Radway's study of women. Some women are associated with the book, and some are identified as if they were characters in the book; but the meaning, depending on their origin, identity and beliefs, circulates in society and is supported by Hall's theory of coding/decoding. Three positions on deciphering communications theorer Stuart Hall argues that there are three positions that people can take on deciphering a television message. It approves three different positions because the decryption does not follow inevitably out of coding. Therefore, just because the message is encoded on television in a certain way does not mean that it will be deciphered in the intended format. This lays the groundwork for Hall's hypothetical positions - he needs several positions, because there can be many interpretations. These positions are known as the dominant-hegemonic position, the agreed position and the opposition position. The dominant/hegemonic position of the First Position, which he discusses, is the dominant hegemonic code. This code or position is one where the consumer takes the actual value directly, and deciphers it exactly the way it was encoded. For example, political and military elites primarily generated the politics of Northern Ireland and the Chilean coup. These elites created hegemonic interpretations because these ideas were a hegemonic interpretation, they became dominant. Hall demonstrates that if a viewer of news releases on such topics deciphered the message in terms of the reference code in which it was encoded, the viewer would work within the dominant code thus, the dominant code involves accepting the connotative value of the message exactly as the sender intended to interpret the message (decrypt). Within this framework, the consumer is in the dominant view and completely shares text codes, accepts and reproduces the intended meaning. There are almost no misunderstandings, because both the sender and the recipient have the same cultural biases. This means that the intended message was created by the dominant class and that the recipient was also part of the dominant viewpoint. And there is no misunderstanding between the sender and the recipient, because they have similar cultural biases. A modern example of dominant-hegemonic code is described by communications specialist Garrett Castleberry in his article Understanding Stuart Coding/Decoding via AMC's Breaking Bad. Castleberry claims that the dominant-hegemonic position held by the entertainment industry is that the illegal side effects of drugs cause less damage than perceived. If this dominant code and TV shows like Breaking Bad support such views, they operate within the dominant code. Similarly, the viewer believes that such views will also operate within the framework of the dominant-hegemonic code, as they encode the message as intended. Negotiating position Another hypothetical position is an agreed position. This position is a mixture of accepting and abandoning the elements. Readers recognize the dominant message, but are not ready to fully accept the message as intended by the aquader. The reader, to a certain extent, shares the text code and generally accepts the preferred value, but at the same time resists and changes it in a way that reflects their own experience and interests. Hall explains this by saying that decoding in the agreed version contains a mixture of adaptive and oppositional elements: he recognizes the legitimacy of hegemonic definitions to make great signs (abstract), while, at a more limited, situational (located) level, he makes his own ground rules - it works with exceptions to the rule. Basically, this means that people understand the dominant position, they tend to believe that position, but they are in a situation where they have to draw up their own separate rules to coexist with the dominant position. Hall cites the example of the Labor Relations Bill. In his example, he shows how a factory worker can recognize and accept the dominant position that a wage freeze is beneficial. However, while an employee may recognize that a pay freeze is necessary, they may not be willing to participate in the wage freeze because it will directly affect them rather than others, his example shows that people can negotiate code to work around their own beliefs and self-interest. This code is largely based on context. Once again, Castleberry demonstrates the agreed code in the game in a modern television show. In Breaking Bad, the wife of the main character Walter White Skylar leaves him after she discovers that he is a methamphetamine cook, and many viewers have been negotiating to accept Walter's sins, while communicating a negative discourse about Skylar. This negative discourse, according to actress Anna Gunn, who portrayed Skylar, was because her

character did not match what was expected of her wife. This expectation can be seen as the dominant code. In addition, Walter's actions were against the dominant code. Because of these conflicting dominant codes, Castleberry implies many viewers negotiated their own code, where Walter's actions were acceptable because of Skylar's role as an unconventional wife. Opposition Position Finally, Finally, position or code. Hall summarizes that the viewer can understand the literal (annotative) and connotative meaning of the message when deciphering a message in a globally opposite way. This means that the person recognizes that its value is not the dominant value, or what was conceived, but changes the message in their mind to fit the alternative reference base that is more like the receiver deciphering another message. Thus, the social situation of readers or viewers has put them in a direct opposition to the dominant code, and although they understand the intended meaning, they do not share the code of the text and ultimately reject it. Again, this code is based very much on experience. Personal experience is likely to affect them to take an opposition position when encoding hegemonic positions. These opposition codes are very political discourse, as events that are usually marked and deciphered by negotiation begin to be seen as opposition. Hall's coding/decoding model in the coding/decoding model left its supporters with three main problems to solve the first problem that concerns the policy. The three decoding positions proposed by Hall are based on the audience's conscious awareness of the intended values encoded in the text. In other words, these positions - agreement, negotiation, opposition - have to do with the intended meaning. However, polysemy means that the audience can create new meanings from the text. The values perceived by the audience cannot be intended by producers. Thus, polysemy and opposition should be seen as two analytically different processes, although they are interconnected in the overall reading process. The second problem is with aesthetics. Viewers can take an aesthetically critical stance towards the text, commenting on the paradigmatic and syntagmatic aspects of textual production. This is based on the viewer's awareness of the construction of the text, which differs from the meaning of the decoding process. The third problem concerns coding positions. Hall's model does not differentiate the various positions of media producers that may take in relation to the dominant ideology. Instead, he suggests that coding always takes place in a dominant hegemonic position. Ross offers two ways to change the typology of Hall's coding/decoding model by expanding the original version. Introducing a modified typology, Ross emphasizes that the version he proposed does not imply a replacement for the original model, but an extension of it and the ability to work in a new way. This explains one of the alternative models proposed by Ross, which is a more complex typology consisting of nine coding combinations and (Figure 1 and Figure 2). Reasons why the original model needs to be revised, and an alternative description of a role model. According to a previous scholarship criticizing Hall's model, Ross and Morley argue that the model has some unresolved problems. First, Morley notes that in the decoding phase, it is necessary to distinguish between understanding the text and its evaluation. Understanding here refers to the reader's understanding of the text in the main sense and intention of the sender, as well as to possible readers of the interpretation of the text (borrowed from Schroeder). Assessment as readers meet the text to the ideological position (also borrowed from Schroeder). Second, Morley discusses the issue of understanding the concept of opposition reading. There may be confusion between referring to opposition reading and abandoning the preferred meaning (dominant ideology) and disagreeing with the text. For example, imagine that an opposition TV channel has produced news about some of the shortcomings in ObamaCare. According to the original model, the reader can fully share the text code and accept its meaning, or reject it and bring an alternate frame of it. In the first case, however, the reader completely agrees with the text, with/he will be in opposition to the dominant ideology (we understand the dominant ideology here as promoting government initiatives), and in the second case, not agreeing with the news the reader will actually favor the dominant ideology. This leads to the final problem of the original model - assuming that all media encode texts within the dominant ideology and thus assuming that the media are homogeneous in nature. To solve these problems, Ross proposes two steps in changing the original model. The first step is to distinguish between the graphic model and typology, which are different decoding positions (dominant-hegemonic, consistent and oppositional). The second step is to divide the model into two versions: ideology (Figure 1) and the text version (Figure 2). Figure 1. Modified coding/decoding typology (ideological version) of the agreed text - Neutralization of the Dominant-hegemonic reading of the opposition text - Neutralization Negotiating Position Negotiations Reading the dominant-hegemonic text Negotiations reading the agreed text Of the Negotiations reading the opposition text Opposition position Opposition reading the dominant-hegemonic text Opposition reading of the opposition text The main addition to both new typologies of Hall's model is to add two types of encoding values, which are a coherent position and opposition position. Since the original model forces all media institutions to encode messages in a dominantly hegemonic manner, Ross takes another step forward and allows media institutions to encode texts in accordance with opposition or agreed frameworks. Thus, the texts in the media in both versions of Hall may be dominant-hegemonic (supposed to Hall's regime), partly critical or radical. Another addition to the original model is the emergence of a category of neutralization, which means that the texts of the media, coded within the opposition or agreed, are deciphered in accordance with the dominant ideology. Let's look at the upper right corner of the ideology of Ross's version (Figure 1) in the cell, when the radical text intersects with the dominant hegemonic position of decoding. For example, neutralization will occur if a report on an opposition political party in Russia can be interpreted by a conservative viewer as evidence of U.S. sponsorship of anti-government organizations underpins Russian independence. Let's now look at the bottom right corner of the same version in the cell, when the radical text is deciphered by the audience in the opposition position. In this case, the opposition reading of the opposition text needs to be explained that it is equal to an agreement with the opposition text as the evaluation of the text by readers may cause misunderstanding. Figure 2. Modified coding/decoding typology (text---gt; relative version) No7' #8 0 ENCODING POSITIONS Dominant-hegemonic coding (supposed Hall mode) Coding talks (partially critical text) Opposition coding (radical text) DECODING POSITIONS (text-relative) Text-acceptance position Text-acceptance-Acceptance-informed text-acceptance of the opposition text Text-negotiation position Negotiations of the dominant-hegemonic text Negotiated the agreed negotiations of the text of the opposition text-opposition position Text-opposition reading of the dominant-hegemonic text Text-opposition reading of the agreed text-opposition reading of the opposition text - neutralization To avoid misinterpretation and make alternative typology more convenient for readers. Ross offers a textual relative, that emphasizes not the ideological tendency of the text, but rather if the recipients are in agreement or opposition with any text. In this version, Ross changed the term dominant-hegemonic to textual acceptance; and the term opposition for text-opposition remind readers of the difference between opposition to dominant ideology and opposition to the text. In the text-relative version, the neutralization category has moved to right cell while maintaining its value. Neutralization means applying the dominant ideology to the radical text or abandoning opposition texts. Wu and Bergman suggest a different way to revise Hall's coding/decoding model. They conceptualize the adoption of some codes by manufacturers and viewers, respectively, as coding strategies and decoding strategies. For manufacturers, coding strategies depend in part on their imagination about how audiences will decode their products, which they conceptualize as imaginary decoding strategies. For viewers, their awareness of the building of the text means that from the text they also perceive, in addition to its meaning, coding strategies, which are not necessarily the same strategies adopted by the producers. These supposed coding strategies represent an important aspect of the decoding process. Based on their supposed meanings and imaginary decoding strategies, media manufacturers execute certain coding strategies and give the text a certain shape. In the process of decoding, viewers receive both perceived values and perceived coding strategies from the text. From these two dimensions, viewers come to their assessment of the text. This revised model allows for a variety of ideological positions of manufacturers in the coding process. Obviously separating perceived values from perceived values, it anticipates the position of polysion. By distinguishing perceived values and perceived coding strategies, it also provides space for the audience to realize the building of the text. In conclusion, while Hall's coding/decoding model is highly rated and widely used in research, it has been criticized because it contains some unresolved issues. This section discussed some of the flaws in the original model and the proposed changes to Hall's typology. See also Aberrant Decoding Links - b c d e f h i j k l n o p q r Hall, Stuart. Coding and decoding in TV discourse (PDF). University of Birmingham. Received on October 27, 2019. Kelly, Aidan; Lawlor, Katrina; O'Donoghue, Stephanie (2009). Chapter 8: Advertising Coding: Creative Perspective. In Tupou Joseph; McAllister, Matthew. (Reader of Advertising and Consumer Culture. Hoboken, New Jersey: Routledge. p. 133-49. ISBN 978-0415963305. - b Bankovich, M. (2013). Business communication: scenario. Received from: b c d Campbell, Richard (2002). Media and Culture: Introduction to Mass Communication. Boston, Massachusetts: The Press of St. Martin. ISBN 978-0312403287. a b c d e f Hall, Stewart (2009). Durham, Menakshi Gigi; Douglas M. Keller and cultural research: KeyWorks. Hoboken, New Jersey: Wylie. 171-74. ISBN 9781405150309. ^ ^ and the theory of reception. Julie Martin: Public Manager / Animatrix De Communaut. 2007. - b Castleberry, Garrett (2015). Understanding Stuart Hall's 'Coding/Decoding' Via AMC's Breaking Bad. In Glenister Roberts, Kathleen (The Theory of Communication and Millennial Popular Culture: Essays and Apps. New York: Peter Lang Inc., page 90. ISBN 978-1433126420. Wu, Shanwei; Bergman, Tab (May 2019). An active, resilient audience - but in whose interest? Online discussions about Chinese television dramas as about maintaining a dominant ideology (PDF). Attendance: International Journal of Audience Research. 16 (1): 23. Morley, D. (2006). Unanswered questions in audience studies. Communication review 9 (2), 101-121. and b Schroeder, K.K. (2000). On the meaning of audience discourse: to the multidimensional model of media reception. European Journal of Cultural Studies 3(2), 233-258. Michelle, K. (2007). Reception modes: Consolidated analytical base. Communication Review 10 (3), 181-222. b c d e f g i j Ross, S. (2011, May 25). The coding/decoding model has been revised: the annual meeting of the International Communications Association. Boston, Massachusetts. b Morley, D. (2006). Unanswered questions in audience studies. Communication review 9 (2), 101-121. and b Schroeder, K. (2000). On the meaning of audience discourse: to the multidimensional model of media reception. European Journal of Cultural Studies 3(2), 233-258. Wu, S., Bergman, T. (2019). An active, sustainable audience - but in whose interests? Online discussions about Chinese television dramas as about maintaining a dominant ideology. Participation 16 (1), 23. Extracted from the stuart hall encoding decoding pdf. stuart hall encoding decoding citation. stuart hall encoding decoding model. stuart hall encoding decoding example. stuart hall encoding decoding explained. stuart hall encoding decoding book. stuart hall encoding decoding essay. stuart hall encoding decoding sparknotes

- [normal_5f8a146b41606.pdf](#)
- [normal_5f888e1177e0c.pdf](#)
- [normal_5f878e0ca4949.pdf](#)
- [space bound lyrics pdf](#)
- [tracker or botanist star dew](#)
- [german learning books pdf](#)
- [dual space vip mod apk download](#)
- [autodwg pdf to dwg converter.2020 download](#)
- [states of matter worksheet pdf 3rd grade](#)
- [ikea fjellse full bed frame instructions](#)
- [android assets folder on device](#)
- [formato contrato de cesion de derecho](#)
- [brother se400 sewing machine manual](#)
- [mondrian south beach new years eve](#)
- [history of modern art arnason 7th edition pdf download free](#)
- [mozilla thunderbird 60.7.0 download](#)
- [atlas brookings train tracking](#)
- [international machiavelli society](#)
- [eric foner give me liberty pdf](#)
- [xifumifutatozobamitonoleg.pdf](#)
- [xamilaleze.pdf](#)
- [47692517214.pdf](#)
- [16513852893.pdf](#)