

Media Bias and Political Affiliation

Name:

Institution Affiliation:

26th January

Introduction

The media bias in the United States is by all accounts an issue in the cutting edge of Americans' minds. A vast part of Americans, adding up to around 80 percent, say they don't believe the media and view it as both dishonest and biased. The uncertainty encourages question in the factuality of the news, and Americans are left addressing how exact is the information they are accepting. In perspective of this, the article by Levendusky and Keaney do concur that the media is inclined on political affiliations. An implicit expression refers to expressions that are implied and proposed while explicit expressions refer to statements expressed detail and in detail, ruling out disarray or uncertainty. This paper will examine both articles with the perspective of talking about their arguments. This paper will discuss both articles with the view of discussing their arguments. Given this, we will study that Kiener's arguments prove to be implicit since it lacks proper study that will support the arguments. However, Levendusky's study proves to be explicit in that the study is supported by an empirical study.

Point-to-point Analysis

The article "Media Bias" by Keaney, highlighted in CQ Researcher, talks about the perspectives of media bias from liberals and conservatives and how late innovation and changing laws influence the view of biases. Also, the article talks about how news coverage standards have changed in US history and the argument for and against objectivity in the news. Conservatives accept there is a media bias, and that the inclination is to a great extent inclined for the opposition party. The Republican Party has made cases for quite a long time that the press has been favoring for the liberal or Democratic Party (Kiener, 2013).

The article by Levendusky investigates the media's part in forming an impression of political polarization. The authors concentrate on daily papers, beginning by searching for the meaning of "polarization" in midterm and presidential race years in the vicinity of 2000 and 2012. Later they directed trials by requesting that participants of the study give views on articles on various issues. The researcher examines the media's part on how it divides peoples' comments in a country, the way new consumers change their particular positions and how they react to individuals from the other party.

Analysis: Keaney article

The Keaney article uses analogy or comparisons in expressing ideas. For example, Jack Shafer, Reuter's media commentator, supports objectivity and agrees that bias causes different conclusions; along these lines, writers ought to be objective keeping in mind the end goal to convey unbiased information to general society. Still, there was a news coverage history educator, Eric Alterman, who argues that if there is objectivity, then there is no bias towards the truth. As a result, there can't be an unmistakable conclusion. Hence, given the above, it is seen that there are contradictory statements

The Keaney article has a doubtful tone that lacks a convincing conclusion whereby a person can agree entirely. This is because many journalists throughout the paper have many ideas on how bias should be defined and how it should be handled. The article suggests that the fundamental issue about media making progress toward objectivity among individuals is the conviction there is such thing as an objectivity that prompts to the truth. As a result, the media should report on both sides. However, regardless of whether news coverage turns out to be objective or not, the arguments highlighted by the article is for the best of the general population.

Hence, the implicit expressions have not necessarily concluded a robust solution but have instead left the reader to be a wild guess on media bias.

Analysis: Levendusky Article

In the article, research was directed by over a specific period. This examination included gathering information and investigation. The results were decisively and persuaded. Levendusky examined and presumed that media scope of polarization increases the conviction among voters that the electorate is biased. This was because the media bias made the voters hate the opposition opinions and convince themselves that their opinions are great. In light of these sentiments that the society is biased, voters relax their positions, trying to compromise so that individuals would consider them to be more moderate (Levendusky& Malhotra, 2016)

Voters are aware of polarization, and as a result, they tend to hate voters with opposing views and would consider them to be a part of the opposing party. That leads voters to react all the more with most of them taking the hatred on a personal level. Thus, the paper has expressed without a doubt on the subject of polarization. The arguments are clear and straightforward.

Conclusion

Despite the fact that media bias is not a correct science, the Keaney article infers that a vast part of Americans doesn't believe the media. Alongside a greater part of the population, liberal and conservatives do trust that media is biased. This pattern of biased left-wing conservative news coverage in the media has just enhanced with the new technology and new legal laws. The Levendusky article has clearly expressed that media polarization made the voters hate the opposition opinions and convince themselves that there's great. In support with this are

data that was collected during the period. Thus, the expressions all through the article have used a clear tone directly expressing the subject matter (Stroud & Lee, 2014).

History demonstrates that media bias has changed throughout the years, and will keep on changing. There are numerous arguments if the media ought to return to being objective or whether there should be no restrictions. Media and its bias have changed all through and will keep on changing as the nation keeps on developing.

References

Kiener, R. (2013, May 3). Media Bias. *CQ Researcher*, 23, 401-424

Levendusky, M., & Malhotra, N. (2016). Does media coverage of partisan polarization affect political attitudes?. *Political Communication*, 33(2), 283-301.

Stroud, N. J., Muddiman, A., & Lee, J. K. (2014). Seeing media as group members: An evaluation of partisan bias perceptions. *Journal of Communication*, 64(5), 874-894.