



Research Article

Volume-02|Issue-05|2021

Review of Public Agenda in the Covid-19 Era

Cruz García Lirios^{*1}, Jorge Hernandez Valdés¹, & Javier Carreón Guillén¹¹Department Social Work, Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México, Huehuetoca, Edomex

Article History

Received: 01.05.2021

Accepted: 15.05.2021

Published: 30.05.2021

Citation

Lirios, C. G., Valdes, J. H., & Guillen, J. C. (2021). Review of Public Agenda in the Covid-19 Era. *Indiana Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(5), 18-21.

Abstract: The media are assumed by the present writing as a key piece in the establishment of an agenda with democratic purposes, however, a review of the categories of spheres, power, freedom, security and justice seem to guide the discussion to its inclusion as instruments of the State for the governability of civil society. In this sense, it is necessary to analyze the possible scenarios in which the media establish the issues that the civil and political spheres discussed around the clarification of their differences. Such an exercise of discussion will allow us to anticipate the contexts in which the four actors, society, market, State and means will pass through three axes that go from power to freedom, from security to insecurity and from justice to injustice supported by two approaches: liberal and community.

Keywords: Power, Freedom, Security, Justice and Sphere.

Copyright © 2021 The Author(s): This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0).

INTRODUCTION

The relationships between public spheres involve the analysis of axes through which individuals' transit in reference to the State and the market. Mainly, the civil and political spheres have been disrupted by the media and in the case of civil society it has been confined to a scenario of perceptions in which the categories of security and justice are transformed into emotions related to anger, and I am afraid and distressed. This process is based on media effects in which a public agenda is established through framing and its associated meanings.

In such a scenario, this paper discusses the relationships that are built between the civil sphere and the political sphere. For this purpose, the media sphere is analyzed about the categories of power, freedom, security and justice. Once exposed their similarities and differences three axes are anticipated for the analysis of the facts and their media coverage.

However, it should be noted that the axes of discussion derive from two approaches: liberal and communal. In the first, the public spheres are considered as instruments of power and freedom, in the second, the categories of power and freedom are assumed as factors external to the community dynamics, their values, beliefs and traditions. In both axes, liberal and communal, the categories of security and justice are transformed into injustice and insecurity through a perceptual process in which the media biases information and disseminates feelings, emotions and emotions related to citizens and communities as victims of political power.

About the construction of a democratic sphere and a participatory agenda, the civil and political spheres not only move along liberal or communal axes, but also oscillate between the senses of power, freedom, security and justice. That is why this paper answer a fundamental question:

Based on the assumption that public spheres are entities of representation, discussion and action, the construction of democracy would be observed in a sphere that, in addition to sharing the characteristics of public spheres, also facilitates the construction of a public agenda, although it is influenced for the issues that the media bias when establishing a framing of the facts.

It should be noted that this document does not intend to carry out an exhaustive review of the terms, rather it tries to relate the categories based on discussion axes that can be used to anticipate at least three scenarios: In the first, the public spheres disseminate freedoms, opportunities, capacities and responsibilities in order to build an antidemocratic public sphere in which the power of the State dilutes the conflicts that will lead to the transformation of the spheres into perceptual entities from which individuals will be located in a plane of relative freedom since they will be able to express and discuss their ideas to the detriment of their safety.

In the second scenario, the individual's approach to build a diversity of private spheres from which the power of the State has been reduced to its minimum expression, but the media have consolidated a media agenda that allows them to define the topics of discussion and n Smut them in emotions, affections and feelings rather than reasoning, planning or deliberation.

In the third scenario, the media have been confined to mere instruments of state power, which has become the guiding axis of discourses and rational and emotional actions both of individuals and of public spheres. The power to be subject to freedom, security and justice in the background that means the emergence of authoritarianism and deliberative totalitarianism and therefore accepted by individuals and spheres to ensure their protection from risk events that threaten their existence.

Public spheres: power, freedom, security and justice the public spheres have been developed as concepts to explain the processes that suppose relations of power, establishment of freedom, guarantee of security and attainment of justice. From a conventional order, the spheres have been classified to identify actors involved in the phenomena that inscribe them as sociological objects. By the spheres are observable and testable, it is worth pointing out that they explain the articulation between society, state and market without denigrating the participation of the media, they are confined to the instrumentation of ideologies or propaganda that from the spheres of power are designed to restrict the freedoms of the civil sphere.

The public spheres suppose a conglomerate of social nuances with respect to which the citizens, the State and the market are coupled to a system of symbols, meanings and meanings oriented towards obtaining freedoms to generate opportunities, develop capacities and establish responsibilities (Villaroel, 2010: 733). In contrast, the military spheres assume society as a homogeneous entity to which they are subordinated no longer by civil control, but by the control of weapons that can be used as instruments of suspension of rights and eventual political instability (Angulo, 2011: 137).

That is, civil society as a sphere of inclusion of individuals assumes that the praetorian order is an instrument of self-control but considers the political and economic spheres as exogenous to its participatory and democratic development. In the political sphere, according to the definition of the civil sphere, the differences between the public and private spheres are resolved, since the State in terms of security is called to be an opportune watchman of civil rights management freedoms and capacities. However, in the case of the economic sphere, civil society delegates its investment and consumption decisions to financial institutions, since the market is considered as a scenario of offers and demands in which citizens only have the right to freedom of choice and not decision (Rodríguez, 2011: 148). In its contractual list essence, State and civil society agreed to subordinate individuals to a framework of political rights in which democracy seems to emerge as the result of clauses, that is, the individual delegates to society in the first instance and to the State in the second order, your freedom.

The notion of civil sphere finds meaning in the most varied phenomena in which society, reduced to the individual, is confronted with the State, although this implies the coexistence of both spheres: civil and political in clear allusion to the market (Urteaga, 2008: 156-157). This is because the values and actions are not linked by planned decisions, but rather by power structures that cross the public spheres and unmark them from their essence such as inclusion, discussion and construction. The market is also a sphere that underlies the political sphere and the civil sphere to protect the symbols of the relations of production. In effect, the public spheres subordinated to the economic sphere find accommodation in the assumptions that reveal them: power, freedom, security and justice.

Power and freedom are essential for the identification of public spheres, but the terms of security and justice serve to discern its scope and limits when it comes to agenda setting. These are three axes in which the spheres travel and disengage to become public. In the first axis, power and freedom, in the second security and insecurity and in the third justice and injustice.

In the first of the axes: power and freedom inhibit the mobility of the civil sphere in reference to the political sphere since the State in its opening to the protection of the private with public interest, restricts freedoms, but the civil sphere in its diversity of expression finds in the freedom of choice a counterweight to the incidence of the State in its privacy (Ávila & Ávila, 2012: 375).

Once opportunities have been established based on freedoms, the civil sphere develops capacities and establishes responsibilities as fundamental parts of its development process (Garzón, 2009: 144).

In the second axes: security and insecurity are concepts that exemplify the distances between civil and political spheres because while society speculates that insecurity is the ultimate manifestation of institutions that restrict freedoms, the ruling class maintains that its primary function is to safeguard public interests, even though surveillance systems are increasingly financed by individuals (Añez *et al.*, 2011: 12).

In the third of the axes: justice and injustice represent the public interests on which are reflected their privacy options that, beyond the relations between State, society and market, the public spheres are exhibited as scenarios in which it is possible to emergence of procedures that allow or inhibit recognition and punishment as measures to regulate relationships between individuals (Mejía, 2011: 144).

In short, the public spheres were constructed from three axes of power-freedom, security-insecurity and justice-injustice from which the spheres have developed discursively, as clusters of thought, society,

state and market have settled their differences based on the establishment of agendas through the media.

However, in the process of converting the civil, political, economic, community and public spheres, the media have privileged the establishment of issues that, due to their association with security events, constructed a representation of the power opposed to that of freedom and freedom. Consequently, the justice-injustice axis was positioned as a pillar in the construction of a democratic agenda. At such a juncture, the media sphere filtered its themes in civil discussion to support the transformation of the political sphere into a sphere of power in which security and justice were issues diametrically opposed to freedom.

The public spheres, in their economic and public, community and liberal, central and peripheral dimensions, articulate a democratic sphere guided by systems of power, freedom, security and justice, but which, when moving towards the perceptual axes inherent to civil society, are transformed into insecurity and injustice (Feenstra, 2008: 52).

In such a scenario, the relationship between state, society and market seems to be in dissonance with the liberal assumption according to which the civil and political spheres are promoters of the economic sphere in which the expressiveness of individuals reaches its maximum splendor.

The public and the private, as the liberal ideology says, are embossed by values, beliefs and actions in which the individual is constituted as a citizen and the formal State raises its security systems in tune with the freedom of choice.

In contrast, in that corresponds to the communal, the civil spheres suppose the improvement of the tribal systems in which the sense of belonging matches with the follow-up of principles that can be collective, group and individual, but that govern the decisions and actions of each community participant. In both axes, liberal and communal, security is perceived when the State exerts its coercive power and underlies the perception of injustice. However, unlike the liberal axis, the communal axis considers that injustice is ancestral and not emergent as assumed by liberal civil society (Sampedro & Resina, 2010: 9).

METHOD

The public agenda, contrary to the political or citizen agenda, seeks to balance informational biases. In this vein, a documentary, cross-sectional and retrospective study is necessary. Documentary in the sense of the flow of information in journals indexed to international repositories. This is a review of titles and abstracts as essential criteria for informational tracking. In this sense, the review cuts in each period mean a cross-

sectional study. All review is retrospective, but not all retrospection involves a review which is unlikely given the accumulation of data. In this way, the scope of the public agenda can be established through a documentary, transversal and retrospective route because technical and delimited cuts are a feasible route for the universe of available information.

The literature review was carried out in repositories such as Academia, Copernicus, Dimensions, Google Scholar, Microsoft Academics, Frontiers, Latindex, Scopus, Redalyc, Scielo, Zenodo and Zotero, considering the search keywords as "agenda", during the period from the pandemic from 2019 to 2021 (see Table 1).

Table 1. Description of sample

	Agenda		
	2019	2020	2021
Academia	4	1	1
Copernicus	3	2	2
Dialnet	2	2	3
Dimensions	5	3	1
Ebsco	4	4	2
Frontiers	1	1	4
Google	3	1	3
JCR	4	1	2
Latindex	2	2	4
Mendeley	1	1	4
Microsoft	2	3	5
Redalyc	1	4	4
Scielo	4	2	3
Scopus	3	3	2
Zenodo	5	1	1
Zotero	4	2	1

Due to the fact that the information will be processed at different levels and episodes, the filter of these data was carried out with a Delphi Matrix Inventory in which the qualifications of expert judges on the issues are recorded. A second phase involves self-correction by comparing the first impressions with the average evaluations of the judges. In the third instance, the reconsideration or reaffirmation of the criteria of the participants allows a new contrast (see Table 2).

Table 2. Delphi Inventory Matrix

Repository	Author	Year	Dimension	References
Scopus	Bermudez <i>et al.</i> ,	2021	Organizational	43
Scielo	Garcia	2021	Mobility	36
Ebsco	Molina <i>et al.</i> ,	2021	Perceptual	57
Scilit	Rincón <i>et al.</i> ,	2021	Institutional	42

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

It is the media that promotes the perceptions of insecurity and injustice in the liberal and communal spheres to influence the political sphere through three effects: agenda, framing and intensity.

The agenda effect assumes that public spheres are exposed to the circulation of information related to topics that the media diffuses according to their interests not in the sense of their audience or expectation levels, but in the sense of the association between the media sphere and the policy whose intention is to govern the other spheres from influencing public opinion, but such an effect is ephemeral since yesterday's issues have been forgotten by the audiences.

The framing effect, according to the framework theory, is the result of the advertising campaigns that are constructed from informative biases in which the State is presented as the guiding axis of public as well as private life according to its actions.

It is exposed as the cause of the levels of security and justice. It is divided into a frame of plausibility to distend the disagreements within the civil sphere around security and injustice.

The media expose information that audiences will contrast with their experiences and adjust the latter to the media framing of the events. In the case of the verifiability framework, the civil and political spheres are at the expense of data that justify their decisions and actions.

In this sense, the media present that information that will serve to define responsibilities. Due to its degree of complexity, the framing effect is the longest in terms of construction and establishment of information biases in the public opinion.

The effect of intensity is more ephemeral because it consists of a series of images that impact the citizen's perception of security events which transforms into risks and threats, as well as the facts of justice which it codifies as impudent State actions. It is an effect that with great precision divides the citizen perception in images and speeches and then guides decisions based on the symbols closest to their representations of power, freedom, security and justice. In this way, the meanings of insecurity and injustice are associated with that of power which is no longer perceived as an instrument of governance, but rather as a mechanism of control and manipulation of the State towards the individual.

In short, the public spheres are exposed to the influence of the media to such an extent that the construction of a democratic agenda is permeated by concepts such as insecurity and injustice which are the result of three effects: agenda, framing and intensity. In such a scenario, the category of power is associated with perceptions of insecurity and injustice while the category of freedom is dissociated from security and justice in the liberal axis through which public spheres move.

CONCLUSIÓN

On the contrary, in the communal axis the public spheres are constructed from the belonging, the commitment and the ancestral trust that suppose the permanence of senses close to the power, freedom, security and justice, but that do not finish substituting the values, norms, uses and customs that within a community are gestated.

REFERENCES

1. Añes M, Rujano R, Párraga J (2011). Citizen security and access to justice. *Legal Issues*, 5, 11-19
2. Ávila, F., Ávila, C. (2012). Power: from M here to v e l or Foucault. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 18, 367-380
3. Mejía, A. (2011). Rawls from justice to law as a political subject. *Ideas and Values*, 147, 143-152
4. Rodríguez, E. (2011). Citizenship: neither natural nor political right? *Republican Magazine*, 11, 137-153
5. Sampedro, V., & Resina, J. (2010). Public opinion and deliberative democracy. An update in the digital context of the network society. *Ponto e Vurgula*, 8, 1-22
6. Villaroel, G. (2010). Social representation of civil society in a Venezuelan sample. *Open Space*, 19, 715-736
7. Bermudez, G., Molina, H. D., & Garcia, C. (2021). Modelling organizational violence in the Covid-19 era. *Journal of Management Information and Decision Science*, 24(5), 1-22
8. García, C. (2021). Metanálisis de la seguridad percibida en el transporte público en la era Covid-19. *Ecomatemático*, 12(1), 120-130
9. Molina, M. R., Coronado, O., Garcia, C. & Quiroz, C. Y. (2021). Contrast a model of security perception. *Journal of Community Medicine and Public Health Care*, 8(77), 1-6
10. Rincon, R. M., Garcia, C. & Molina, M. R. (2021). Specification a model of institutional violence. *International Journal of Current International Research*, 7(2), 1525-1530.