

Mass Media and its uses, effects on the Environment and Modern World

Abdulai Abu

Department of Ancient and Modern Languages University of Sierra Leone

ABSTRACT

Mass media means technology that is proposed to reach a mass audience. It is the primary sources of communication used to reach the vast majority of the general public. The most common platforms for mass media are newspapers, television, radio, magazines, and the Internet. The mass media are enhanced media technologies which are proposed to contact huge audience by mass communication but technology varies based on the communication. Electronically data can be transmitted through communicate media, for example, film, TV, radio and recorded music. In order to recognize and elucidate current developments in the media landscape, using the lens of innovation and innovation theory adds value to media research. Innovation is about change. Media products and services are changing.

Keywords: Mass Media, Communication, Environment, Modern World

INTRODUCTION

Mass media" is a deceptively simple term encompassing a countless array of institutions and individuals who differ in purpose, scope, method, and cultural context [1,2,3]. Mass media include all forms of information communicated to large groups of people, from a handmade sign to an international news network [4]. There is no standard for how large the audience needs to be before communication becomes "mass" communication. There are also no constraints on the type of information being presented [5]. A car advertisement, a fake social media post coming from Russia, and a U.N. resolution are all examples of mass media. Because "media" is such a broad term, it will be helpful in this discussion to focus on a limited definition. In general usage, the term has been taken to refer to only "the group of corporate entities, publishers, journalists, and others who constitute the communications industry and profession [5]. This definition includes both the entertainment and news industries. Another common term, especially in talking about conflict, is "news media."

News media include only the news industry. It is often used interchangeably with "the press" or the group of people who write and report the news. In 2020, this definition of mass media is clearly too narrow [6]. Social media--including Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, YouTube, Tumblr and the like -- allows anyone in the world to post pretty much anything they want--true or false--with very little oversight or censorship. This has resulted in the widespread use of "bots"--computers--that generate millions of fake, almost always inflammatory, stories which they widely post on these social media apps, masquerading as real people, even as known friends of real people. This is thought to significantly sway public opinion toward the extremes--in the U.S., for example, making conservatives think that liberals are far worse than they really are, and making liberals think the opposite. The result is increasing polarization of both the electorate and our decision makers, making our political processes largely dysfunctional [7].

At the same time, in the U.S., the Trump administration has demonized the legitimate news media, calling any story that criticizes him, and others, "fake news," and declaring journalists to be "enemies of the people." This has led his followers to rely on media that is friendly to Trump--Fox News and social media, and to distrust anything they get from traditional news outlets. It has also led to numerous physical attacks on journalists. Most recently, this happened on several occasions during the May-June 2020 protests about police brutality following the death of George Floyd. Attacking journalists is not limited to the United States of course [8]. Perhaps the most high-profile recent example was the Saudi Arabian murder of Jamal Khashoggi, a Washington Post reporter and Saudi dissident, who was assassinated in the Saudi consulate in Istanbul in 2018. But journalists have been at risk world wide for a long time. The Committee to Protect Journalists reports that 1373 Journalists have been killed between 1992 and 2020, all over the world. So being a journalist is a dangerous business, and it seems to be getting more dangerous all the time. Going back to what Jennifer Akin wrote in 2005, the distinction between news and entertainment can at times be fuzzy, but news is technically facts and interpretation of facts, including editorial opinions, expressed by journalism professionals. Which facts are included, how they are reported, how much interpretation is given, and how much

space or time is devoted to a news event is determined by journalists and management and will depend on a variety of factors ranging from the editorial judgment of the reporters and editors, to other news events competing for the same time or space, to corporate policies that reflect management's biases [9]. The distinction between news, entertainment, and opinion has gotten much fuzzier since 2005. The U.S.-based Daily Show, aired on the cable news channel Comedy Central, hosted by Jon Stewart from 1999-2015, was one of the earliest (and best known) examples of a TV show that blended news and entertainment. (It still does so, although the host is now Trevor Noah.) Although Stewart defended his clear leftist bias at the time by asserting the show was "only entertainment," many people--particularly young people, relied on the Daily Show as their primary or only source of news. Legitimate news organizations, too, seem now to be blurring the distinction between "news" and "opinion." [10]. In response to the New York Times' firing of its Editorial Page director, James Bennet, over the publication of an op-ed by Republican U.S. Senator Tom Cotton in June 2020, Roger Cohen penned an editorial arguing that "both sides" journalism is under attack by those who advocate journalism that operates from a "place of moral clarity." [11]. This notion is echoed and taken further by another Times opinion writer, Ross Douthat, who wrote (also in response to the Bennet firing).

Definition of mass media

Mass Media is defined as the means to communicate with the general public. Mass media is the sources that the general public uses to get their information from. For example, think of the way you made

use of to access to this information. You have most likely used the Internet to gain access to this Web page. Your use of accessing this page is considered a source of mass media [12].

Mass Media Examples

What would you tune in to if you don't have the Internet or TV? Then, you will have to rely on the oldest form of mass media, which is Radio. Yes, before the advent of the Internet and TV, masses used to tune in to Radio programs for their news sources. You would too if you currently don't have the Internet or Newspaper is the first form of mass media. It was the original platform for mass media before the evolution of radio, TV, and the Internet. All these examples above show the importance of mass media and their sources. Mass media technology is the primary source of communication. By making use of mass media, it is possible to reach the vast majority of the public. Most common platforms for mass media include: Newspapers (Though the digital media is being popular, still - a greater portion of Americans and educated senior

people from all over the world love reading Newspapers (Either its a paperback form or in Digital Form though Android/iOS app or Websites) [13]. Magazines (Unlike newspapers, people love storing Magazines and Tabloids on their drawing room. That means, such communication media is there to stay and well-cherished for a long-long time). Television (It has a greater effect based on the Cultivation Theory of Marshall McLuhan - who says that - the consumers believes in what they see on Television). Radio (Even in war of some country, the military officials sent alerts to remote areas via Radio. So, this was a great media for mass communication once upon a time. Still, FM Radios are being popular and people listen to them a lot these days) [14].

Types of Mass Media

Mass Media has evolved significantly over the past few hundred years. It is mainly due to the advent of the digital media. Before the Internet, TV, and radio, the newspaper was the first form of mass media. For centuries, the public relied on newspapers to provide them with the latest in current events. Then, just before the beginning of the 20th century; radio emerged as the relevant source of mass media. Before the advent of Television,

families would gather around the radio to listen to radio station programs. Mass Communication. Mass Communication involves a person, an organization, or a group of people sending messages through a channel of communication to a large audience. Channels of communication cover radio, broadcast television, social media, and print media materials [15].

Mass Communication Definition

Mass Communication is referred to as the channels of communication sending messages to a large group of unknown and mixed people. Mass communication is

unlike interpersonal communication. It is because, with mass communication, there are chances of feedback in mass communication [16].

Mass Communication Examples: Mass Media Communication Channels

There are 8 Mass Communication Examples you can learn from and use on your own purposes. Journalism that focuses on collecting and publishing news:

This kind of study of journalism that produce and distribute content that conveys broader message to public through newspapers, Televisions, Radio

and smartphones. It complies with Civic Journalism and Citizen Journalism. Advertising that encourages purchasing behavior: The advertisers or sponsors actually controls the message here about which and what to spread on to mass people. Public relations: They are basically managers who decide which news or contents to go to mass media like Papers and TVs right after producing the advertisement or news [17].

Social Media: Social Media websites like Facebook, Twitter, TikTok, YouTube, Instagram and LinkedIn are the mainstream ways (new media) these days to reach out to mass public of a specific or broader region [18].

IMPORTANCE OF MASS MEDIA

Mass communicated media saturated the industrialized world in 2005; this is true for the non-industrialized world, too, in 2020.) The television in the living room, the newspaper on the doorstep (not so much anymore!), the radio in the car, the computer and tablet, the fliers in the mailbox, and now most importantly, perhaps in 2020, the cell phone are just a few of the media channels daily delivering advertisements, news, opinion, music, and other forms of mass communication. Because the media are so prevalent, they have an extremely powerful impact on how we view the world [2]. Nearly everything we know about current events and politics comes from the media--it is only the most local and personal events that are experienced first-hand. Events in the larger community, the state, the country, and the rest of the world are experienced almost entirely through the media, be it a professional journalist or a "citizen journalist" posting on social media. Not only do the media report the news, they

Film: These days, Film is not only a form of entertainment; instead they spread or convey a specific message for the society or the country where the films/drama/short-films are released.

Books (paperback) or E-Books: Books are widely spread and ebook is way more advanced stuff to spread a message that people will read carefully and thus such information or message sticks to the people's mind [19].

Photography: Theme based photography always portray a message on each of their photos. Either it's a revenge or positive or negative; this visual medium of mass communication is becoming widely popular in all over the world.

create the news by deciding what to report. The "top story" of the day has to be picked from the millions of things that happened that particular day [7]. After something is deemed newsworthy, there are decisions on how much time or space to give it, whom to interview, what pictures to use, and how to frame it. Often considered by editors, but seldom discussed, is how the biases and interests of management will impact these determinations. All of these decisions add up to the audience's view of the world, and those who influence the decisions influence the audience. The media, therefore, have enormous importance to conflict resolution because they are the primary -- and frequently only -- source of information regarding conflicts. If a situation doesn't make the news (now including social media), it simply does not exist for most people. When peaceful options such as negotiation and other collaborative problem-solving techniques are not covered, or their successes are not reported, they become invisible and are

not likely to be considered or even understood as possible options in the

management of a conflict [9].

Negatives

The news media thrive on conflict. The lead story for most news programs is typically the most recent and extreme crime or disaster. Conflict attracts viewers, listeners, and readers to the media; the greater the conflict the greater the audience, and large audiences are imperative to the financial success of media outlets [5]. Therefore, it is often in the media's interest to not only report conflict, but to play it up, making it seem more intense than it really is. Long-term, on-going conflict-resolution processes such as mediation are not dramatic and are often difficult to understand and report, especially since the proceedings are almost always closed to the media. Thus conflict resolution stories are easily pushed aside in favor of the most recent, the most colorful, and the most shocking aspects of a conflict. Groups that understand this dynamic can cater to it in order to gain media attention. Common criteria for terrorist attacks include timing them to coincide with significant dates, targeting elites, choosing sites with easy media access, and aiming for large numbers of casualties.[10] Protesters will hoist their placards and start chanting when the television cameras come into view. It is not unusual for camera crews or reporters to encourage demonstrators into these actions so they can return to their studios with exciting footage. The resulting media coverage can bestow status and even legitimacy on marginal opposition groups, so television coverage naturally becomes one of their planned strategies and top priorities. The "30-second sound bite" has become a familiar phrase in television and radio news and alert public figures strategize to use it to their advantage. In most parts of the industrialized world, the news has to "sell," because the handful of giant media conglomerates that control most of the press (media outlets) place a high priority on profitable operations. Their CEOs are under relentless pressure to generate high

returns on their shareholders' investments. Media companies face tight budgets and fierce competition, which often translate into fewer foreign correspondents, heavy reliance on sensationalism, space and time constraints, and a constant need for new stories. Reporters with pressing deadlines may not have time to find and verify new sources. Instead they tend to rely on government reports, press releases, and a stable of vetted sources, which are usually drawn from "reliable" companies and organizations. Most overseas bureaus have been replaced by "parachute journalism," where a small news crew spends a few days or less in the latest hotspot [4]. These same media outlets are also dependent upon advertisement revenue, and that dependence can compromise their impartiality. Many newspapers and television stations think twice before reporting a story that might be damaging to their advertisers, and will choose to avoid the story, if possible. According to a survey taken in 2000, "...about one in five (20 percent) of local and (17 percent) (of) national reporters say they have faced criticism or pressure from their bosses after producing or writing a piece that was seen as damaging to their company's financial interests." [2] The drive to increase advertising revenue has led many local news shows to measure out world news in seconds to accommodate longer weather and sports reports. In 2005, (Aiken wrote) the news that was reported in the West came from an increasingly concentrated group of corporate- and individually-owned conglomerates. The majority of all media outlets in the United States and a large share of those internationally were owned by a handful of corporations: Vivendi/Universal, AOL/Time Warner (CNN), The Walt Disney Co. (ABC), News Corporation (FOX), Viacom (CBS), General Electric (NBC), and Bertelsmann [3]. These companies' holdings included

international news outlets, magazines, television, books, music, and movies as well as large commercial subsidiaries that were not part of the media. Many of these companies are the result of mergers and acquisitions that began in the 1980s, when Ronald Reagan's de-regulatory policies began to facilitate such consolidation, and further mergers have occurred ever since. Recently (now speaking of the period 2015-2020), this trend has continued and even accelerated. It has been particularly evident in "local news." Edmund Andrews, from Stanford wrote in 2019 that Local TV news shows collectively attract 25 million nightly viewers, far more than national cable programs such as Fox News and MSNBC. And that's been attractive to major media conglomerates, which have been snapping up local TV stations in recent years. As of 2016, five big companies controlled 37% of these stations. In addition, the Stanford/Emory study suggested that media conglomerates could sway national elections. "There is a lot of evidence from other research that the political content of news affects election outcomes," Martin says. "So the evidence that we present, which shows that the tastes of media owners affect local news content, means the owners of media outlets have a lot of political power [7]. That's something that regulators of media should take into account." The same thing is happening with local newspapers--they have been increasingly bought out by large conglomerates such as GateHouse Media (which recently bought Gannet, also a large conglomerate owner of local papers), and Alden Global Capital.

According to Leonhardt of the New York Times (and many other observers as well,) these conglomerates don't care at all about the quality of local media. Rather, they usually gut the papers of reporters, replacing the local coverage with one-size-fits all national news, slanted the way the conglomerate wants. Or they just run the newspapers into the ground and close them down. Going back to Aiken's words in 2005, in addition to the control exercised by owners, there are also government controls and self-censorship. The United States, governed by a constitution where the First Amendment guarantees freedom of the press, has arguably one of the most free presses in the world, and is one of the few countries where the right to free speech is expressly written into the constitution. Yet even the U.S. government exerts control over the media, particularly during times of war or crisis. In many other countries around the world, especially emerging nations and dictatorships, governments impose tight restrictions on journalists, including penalties ranging from fines to imprisonment and execution. In these environments, rigorous self-censorship is necessary for survival. In a major survey of 287 U.S. journalists, "about a quarter of those polled have personally avoided pursuing newsworthy stories." This problem, too, has gotten much worse since Donald Trump was elected U.S. President in 2016. As we said above, he routinely labels any story he doesn't like "fake," and uses Twitter as his mass media outlet to let everyone know what is "real" in his view.

Positives

Aiken's commentary from 2005) Without the media, most people would know little of events beyond their immediate neighborhood. The further one goes outside of one's circle of friends and family, the more time-consuming and expensive it becomes to get information--without media [9]. Very few, if any, individuals have the resources to stay

independently informed of world events. With the news and social media, however, all one has to do is turn on a television or turn to the Internet. Even when it is biased or limited, it is a picture of things that are happening around the world. The more sources one compares a diversity of sources, the more accurate the picture that can be put together. In addition to

the media conglomerates, there are also a range of independent news outlets, though they have a much smaller audience. Some of these provide an alternative view of events and often strive to publish stories that cannot be found in the mainstream media. So, too, in 2020, does social media, although it is increasingly hard to tell what social media posts are "legitimate" and which are, indeed, fakes--brought to you by Russian "bots," for instance. However, the Internet now makes it possible to read papers and watch broadcasts from around the globe. While language skills can be a barrier, it is possible to live in the United States and watch Arab-language broadcasts from the Middle East, or to get on the Internet and read scores of Chinese newspapers. Having access to these alternative voices limits the power of monopolies over information [11].

Another important benefit of a functioning mass media is that information can be relayed quickly in times of crisis. Tornado and hurricane announcements can give large populations advance warning and allow them to take precautions and move out of harm's way. In a country suffering war, a radio broadcast outlining where the latest fighting is can alert people to areas to avoid. In quieter times, the media can

publish other useful announcements, from traffic reports to how to avoid getting HIV. It is a stabilizing and civilizing force. This, too, of course, is under attack in 2020, as Donald Trump is using Twitter and other mass media (such as ally Fox News) to spread massive amounts of false information about the COVID-19 pandemic. So, the while the mass media still has the potential to be a "stablizing and civilizing force," As Akin wrote in 2005, it no longer so clearly is. Along the same lines, the news media allow elected and other officials to communicate with their constituents. Frequently, the delegates at a negotiation will find they understand each other much better over the course of their discussions, but that understanding will not reach the larger populations they represent without a concerted communications effort. If constituents are not aware of these new understandings (and subsequent compromises) during the course of negotiations, they will almost certainly feel cheated when a final agreement falls far short of their expectations. To achieve ratification, delegates must justify the agreement by discussing it with and explaining it to their constituents throughout the entire process [6] and the media is often used for this purpose.

CNN Effect

A recent media (in 2005) phenomenon dubbed the "CNN effect" occurs when powerful news media (i.e. CNN) seem to be creating the news by reporting it. It has been argued that CNN, with its vast international reach, sets the agenda by deciding which items are newsworthy and require the attention of government leaders [8]. Traditionally, agenda-setting has been seen as the prerogative of government. It is also argued that

emotionally-charged footage of people suffering, such as mass starvation, bombed-out markets, and burning houses, arouse the public to demand immediate action. This gives leaders little time to think through an appropriate response and can force them to take valuable resources from more urgent, less photogenic issues. This use of sensational imagery is cited as being responsible for the United States' ill-fated involvement in

Somalia : "In the words of one U.S. congressman, 'Pictures of starving children, not policy objectives, got us into Somalia in 1992. Pictures of U.S. casualties, not the completion of our objectives, led us to exit Somalia.' "[7] On the other hand, failure of the media to fully report on the genocide that claimed an estimated 800,000 lives in Rwanda during a 100-day period in 1994, made it easy for Western governments to ignore the crisis that they preferred not to acknowledge until long after it ended. The CNN effect also brings up issues of accuracy. The New York Times, with its vast resources, has long been known as "the newspaper of record; once something is reported by this leading news outlet it is accepted as fact (unverified) and

carried by other outlets, even when errors creep into the Times' account. (In 2020, the Times is now considered the newspaper of record by liberals only; it is seen as a top purveyor of fake news by President Trump and many of his allies and followers. Some observers argue that the CNN effect is overrated, if not complete myth. Warren Strobel and Susan Carruthers, for example, argue that the U.S. government has not been forced into doing anything; rather, it used reaction over media stories to introduce policies that it already desired. Strobel also argues that any action a politician undertakes as a result of this pressure will be merely a "minimalist response" -- a limited action that suggests a greater response than has taken place [11].

Theories of Journalism

Any discussion of media and conflict eventually leads to the purpose and responsibilities of journalists. A Western audience expects objectivity of its news reporters. While most citizens take this for granted, objective reporting has not been the historical norm. The concept of objectivity itself has often been the focus of debate. As Susan Carruthers states, "... news can never be 'value-free,' from 'nobody's point of view.' "[9] It is a sentiment voiced by numerous journalism professionals and teachers. Deciding what the news is requires a value judgment. In the Western news media there is a consensus that news is something unusual which departs from everyday life and is quantifiable. For example, the outbreak of war is news, but any fighting thereafter might not be. As the war continues, its newsworthiness depends on whether the news agency's home troops are involved, whether the troops of close allies are involved, how many casualties are reported, how photogenic the victims

are, whether reporters have access to the fighting and information about it, and what other stories occur at the same time. Western news consists of events, not processes. This bias can result in news reports where events seem to have no context [12]. In response to the drawbacks of 'objective' journalism, some journalists have begun advocating for alternative models, such as "peace journalism" and "public journalism." Peace journalism advocates the belief that journalists should use the power of the media to help resolve conflict rather than report it from a distance. Its detractors argue that "[o]nce a journalist has set himself the goal of stopping or influencing wars, it is a short step to accepting that any means to achieve that end are justified. ... There can be no greater betrayal of journalistic standards"[10]. Another "new" trend (in 2005) was "public journalism" which seeks to explore issues affecting a community and stay with those issues long enough to give the community

enough information to understand the conflict and get involved. This, however, often requires a long-term commitment by the journalist and news media to follow a story over the course of the conflict. If the story is of continuing high importance to the readers -- such as a war

that involves local troops, such coverage is common. If the story is not deemed continuously "newsworthy," however, it takes a committed journalist to continue to write about it and a news outlet that permits such committed reporting [11].

REFERENCES

- [1] Schaffert, Richard W. "The Media's Influence on the Public's Perception of Terrorism and the Question of Media Responsibility." *Media Coverage and Political Terrorists*. New York: Praeger Publishers. 1992: 61-79
- [2] Kohut, Andrew. "Self-Censorship: Counting the Ways." *Columbia Journalism Review*. May/June 2002. <http://www.cjr.org/year/00/2/censorship.asp>
- [3] <http://www.mediachannel.org/ownership/chart.shtml>
- [4] Sanders, Edmund. "Results of FCC's Media Studies Are Released." *Los Angeles Times*. Oct. 2, 2002. <http://pqasb.pqarchiver.com/latimes/202977141.html?did=202977141&FMT=ABS&FMTS=FT&desc=California%3b+Results+of+FCC%27s+Media+Studies+Are+Released>
- [5] Kohut, Andrew. "Self-Censorship: Counting the Ways." *Columbia Journalism Review*. May/June 2002.
- [6] Laws, David. "Representation of Stakeholding Interests." *The Consensus Building Handbook*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications. 1999.
- [7] Carruthers, Susan L. *The Media at War*. New York: St. Martin's Press. 2000. p 206
- [8] Strobel, Warren. 1996. *Managing Global Chaos: Sources and Responses to International Conflict*, eds. Chester A. Crocker and Fen Osler Hampson with Pamela Aall. Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press. p. 366.
- [9] Carruthers, Susan L. *The Media at War*. New York: St. Martin's Press. 2000. p. 17.
- [10] Weaver, Tim. "The End of War." *Track Two*. Vol. 7, No. 4. <http://ccrweb.ccr.uct.ac.za/archive/two/7-4/p21-endofwar.html>

- [11] Special thanks to Richard Salem, President of Conflict Management Initiatives, for his assistance in drafting this essay.
- [12] The New York Times published a lengthy interview with Stewart in June 2020 in which he reflected on his role in blending news and entertainment, and contributing, perhaps, to the confusion of the two. (Search for the phrase "We jused to have news and we had entertainment" to see Stewart's thoughts on this topic.)
- [13] Roger Cohen, "The Outcry Over 'Both Sides' Journalism" *New York Times*. June 12, 2020. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/12/opinion/journalism-debate.html>
- [14] Ross Douthat: "The Tom Cotton Op-Ed and the Cultural Revolution." *New York Times*, June 12, 2020. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/12/opinion/nyt-tom-cotton-oped-liberalism.html>
- [15] Edmund L. Andrews "Media Consolidation Means Less Local News, MORE Right Wing Slant," *Insights by Stanford Business* <https://www.gsb.stanford.edu/insights/media-consolidation-means-less-local-news-more-right-wing-slant>
- [16] Julie Bosman "How the Collapse of Local News is Causing a 'National Crisis'" *New York Times*. November 20, 2019. <https://www.nytimes.com/2019/11/20/us/local-news-disappear-pen-america.html>
- [17] Pen America "Losing the News" <https://pen.org/local-news/>
- [18] David Markowitz "Trump is Lying More than Ever: Just Look at the Data" *Forbes*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/davidmarkowitz/2020/05/05/trump-is-lying-more-than-ever-just-look-at-the-data/#10ca8c31e176>

www.idosr.org

Abu

19] Roger Cohen, "The Outcry Over 'Both Sides' Journalism" New York Times. June 12, 2020. <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/12/opinion/journalism-debate.html>