

THE MAN-MEDIA AS THE LATEST MEDIA

UDC 316.773

Gordana Stamenković

University of Rome Tor Vergata, Italy

Department of Historical, Philosophical and Social Sciences, Cultural Heritage and Land

Abstract. *The author tends to analyze the man-media as the latest media (in the author's opinion) in the field of current media, a phenomenon that does not (in the author's view) belong to civic nor participative journalism, nor can its media activity be subsumed under UGC (user generated content). The question of whether the man-media in reality is a media and its role in the public sphere are the focus points of consideration of man as media. The man-media is considered an informative-oriented individual, interested in public matters and its own active engagement in public affairs, independently producing and placing the media content: news, information, reports, comments, stories, analytical articles. The author uses the same name for a group or multitude of individuals with the same goals, taking both journalism as a craft and the media as an institution, and uniting them in their own, individual and autonomous activity. The man-media emerges due to the fact that the existing media do not perform their primary functions in a manner that satisfies the citizens' needs, and thanks to the modern technology providing numerous opportunities for an individual to collect information, create media content and distribute them independently, in a faster and easier manner.*

Key words: *man, media, democracy, internet, information, public sphere.*

1. INTRODUCTION

In our opinion, the latest in the abundance of new media is man: man-media. Our understanding of man as media – that we dare to set up as a discussion topic, based on our observations of the characteristics of the modern media sphere – is not compared nor associated with the concept of civic journalism that appeared in the USA in late 1980's as a response to the perceived crisis of public communications. To provide insight into the differences, we shall present a few words on the latter concept. Namely, in late eighties, the American media analysts made strong warnings that democracy was on the verge of a

Received January 22, 2015 / Accepted January 31, 2015

Corresponding author: Gordana Stamenković

University of Rome Tor Vergata, Department of Historical, Philosophical and Social Sciences, Cultural Heritage and Land, Italy

E-mail: mionadecan@gmail.com

major crisis. They claimed that modern political communication, adopted by the media and politicians, discouraged the political engagement of citizens, diminished their knowledge of public affairs, reduced their trust in Government and political institutions, and brought an overall negative effect to the level of political activism (Entman 1989; Hart 1994; Capella and Jamieson 1997; Schechter 1997).

As a response to the noted communication crisis, a movement known as civic or public journalism emerged in the United States. Its advocates Jay Blumler, Michael Gurevitch, Jay Rosen and others believed that socially engaged journalism may have a key role in overcoming the crisis. Journalism, as they often pointed out, has the task to advocate and encourage the active role of citizens in the selection of news and defining the topics to be placed in the media agenda, insisting on the revitalization of a *strong community* as the foundation of a healthy democracy. Jay Rosen, one of the first and most active theorists of the idea of civic journalism, claimed that rational public debate among citizens, as the basis of healthy democratic procedure, almost entirely vanished, thus stating that the role of journalists should be “forming, as much as informing a public” (Rosen 1995, 7). He further considers that journalism should more decisively place itself at the service of the public, and more directly support the public debate. “Traditional journalism believes that people need to be informed so they can participate effectively. In public journalism, we think the reverse is often true: Information is what we have – we live in a sea of information – while democracy is what we need” (Ibid).

The term civic journalism came into wider use in 1993 when Poynter Institute for Media Studies published Rosen's booklet *Community Connectedness: Passwords for Public Journalism*. However, we find experimental rudiments of civic journalism as early as in 1988, in a local Kansas newspaper *Wichita Eagle*, owned by the *Knight-Ridder* corporation. The newspaper editor Davis Merritt decided that, reporting on the Presidential election campaign between Bush and Dukakis, his newspaper would write about the topics the citizens were actually interested in, and not about the ones that politicians wanted to talk about. The *Wichita Eagle* continued the same practice two years later, during the Senate elections. Davis Merritt said that, with such a new, different practice, journalism “lets loose of its artificially imposed limitations” (The *Wichita Eagle*, editorial, November, 1990). “Public journalism”, Merritt (1994, 28) wrote, “allows journalists to rise above the role of observers and distributors of technical and strategic information”.

The editors of another newspaper owned by the same corporation, *Ledger-Enquirer*, at approximately the same time decided to learn about the citizens' opinions on their city and its future, so they initially included a questionnaire in the newspaper, asking the readers to define the problems that should be addressed. The *Ledger-Enquirer* published the survey results, but the published material did not encourage any concrete action. For this reason, the Editor-in-Chief, Jack Swift, decided to close the gap between the journalists and the public, so he organized a gathering of the citizens of Columbus in the City Assembly, at the newspaper's expense. Around three hundred of the gathered citizens discussed the problems in the city, later on forming a movement “United 2000”. This movement has provoked the organization of similar movements in smaller settlements around Columbus, and it also led to the foundation of a number of groups for putting pressure on the local authorities. The *Ledger-Enquirer* began to serve as a bulletin board with readers' letters, and in Rosen's opinion it entirely reconstructed the common stand of newspapers towards the debate as a fundamental category of the public sphere. The third example of civic journalism was the case of the newspaper the *Charlotte Observer* from North Carolina,

also owned by *Knight-Ridder*. This newspaper applied the civic journalism model during the Senate elections in 1992.

All three newspapers started from the assumption that public discourse was undergoing a crisis, and recognized a need to take certain steps to overcome it, since the common journalistic practice did not cause much effect. All three newspapers stepped beyond the framework of conventional journalism of that time and took the role of an “active catalyst in public debate inside the community” (Schudson 1998, 141).

The idea, and then the application of this model, caused much criticism. Civic journalism was attacked by the journalists themselves, who saw civic journalism as an obstruction to the fundamental principles of journalism: objectivity and independence. The second group of objections most commonly referred to the hidden motives of newspaper owners and an outdated understanding of community, while on the general level the model critics pointed out the issue of the theories the whole concept resides on – the theory of communitarianism and the public sphere.

The civic journalism model provided the citizens with an opportunity to influence the agenda, adding the topics of their interest. They participated in the newspaper editing process, while the majority of work was performed by the journalists. Civic participation was of crucial importance for the revival of public discourse, but it can be described more as a certain “redesign” of the editing policy for newspapers, which kept their structure and organization intact, than a substantial change in the manner of communication.

The man-media, in our opinion, does not belong to the corpus of civic journalism, either by form or by essence. We also take the position that the concept of man-media, despite sharing multiple formal and essential similarities with participative journalism “which in the sociology of news literature, has become commonly accepted to refer to the wide variety of initiatives undertaken by mainstream media to enhance the integration of all kinds of user contributions in the making of news” (Paulussen and Ugille 2008, 25), has gradually gone beyond that concept and formed itself as a distinct and autonomous phenomenon. Additionally, in the mediative effect of the man-media we note a difference compared to UGC (user generated content), a term which has become established as the catch-all phrase to describe material created by audiences, in news and non-news contexts. Both of these terms (participatory journalism such as UGC), encompass a range of phenomena: citizen journalism (Allan 2006), networked journalism (Gillmor 2004), blogging (Lowrey 2006; Matheson 2004; Singer 2005) and collaborative journalism (Kim and Hamilton 2006). Finally, there is also a difference in the man-media action compared to Networked journalism which is a term coined by the new media commentator Jeff Jarvis and: “Takes into account the collaborative nature of journalism: professionals and amateurs working together to get the real story, linking to each other across brands and old boundaries to share facts, questions, answers, ideas, perspectives. It recognizes the complex relationships that will make news. And it focuses on the process more than the product” (www.buzzmachine.com/2006/07/05/networked-journalism).

2. TOWARDS THE MAN-MEDIA

We may speak of an entirely new media being born, whose indications can already be noticed. The man-media is every informative-oriented individual, interested in public matters and his own active engagement in public affairs, independently producing and

placing media content: news, information, reports, comments, stories, analytical articles. We use the same name for a group or multitude of individuals with the same goals, taking both journalism as a craft and the media as an institution, and uniting them in their own, individual and autonomous activity. The man-media emerges due to the fact that the existing media do not perform their primary functions in a manner that satisfies the citizens' needs, and thanks to the modern technology providing numerous opportunities for an individual to collect information, create media content and distribute it independently, in a faster and easier manner.

The space of man-media activity and influence is the Internet sphere. The technical resources used in the process of collecting and distributing information are video cameras, mobile phones, and Internet technology. The man-media practices all journalistic genres, from news and reports, through serial articles, essays, reviews and comments, to detailed stories. They collect information from multiple sources and verify their credibility, perform interviews, research procedure, and event analysis. Finally, the man-media publishes the information in a fast and easy way, using, once again, the Internet technology. The Internet as a media is crucial for the emergence and *activity of the man-media*. In the process of informative and media acts, we see the symbiosis of the Internet platform with human potential (volitional choice, analysis, motivation for participation in public affairs, a critical mind, the adaptation of the Internet sphere to one's own needs, social and technology-operating skills) as a foundation and necessary condition for the man-media functioning.

Unlike the traditional media, the man-media is interactive, oriented in multiple directions, collecting information and providing feedback, functioning by the one-to-many: many-to-one principle. The man-media is interested in providing correct information, since his interest is to receive complete and accurate information from another man-media as well. In a group of man-media, accuracy and comprehensiveness of information is one of the main reasons to connect and cooperate. Publishing incorrect information, disinformation or manipulative action in a group of man-media is followed by sanctions, involving public criticism, indication of manipulation, ignoring, lack of contact and cooperation. While the type and amount of information distributed by the traditional media depend on the media editing policy (which further depends on the interests of media owners and the centers of economic and political power), the man-media distributes information he has objective knowledge of, the information that comes as a result of his engagement and the needs identified in the process of online communication with other citizens. The man-media search for and receive the information they are interested in, the one that serve their needs and fields of interest.

Internet forums are a space where information is placed – given and received – and opinions and advice exchanged. The space is intended for comments and criticisms, reactions to events. Forums are practically the virtual newspapers of the groups participating in it. It involves no newsroom with a determined number of journalists, no fixed editing policy, but has plenty of information, comments, reactions, criticisms, exchange. The relations among participants are flexible and ad hoc, but we can already notice numerous forums with pages specialized in certain matters, so in a certain sense we may speak about certain stabilization, the consolidation of the man-media role in the process of providing information and communication.

The forum "journalists" come and go, but the essence remains the same – the information collected by the man-media is distributed and exchanged by the man-media himself.

Any reaction on the social media (Twitter, Facebook, etc.) to current events or the manner of traditional media reporting on an event, is the man-media offering corrections of the news published by other media and placing news he has knowledge of. We are often witnesses of very vibrant and constructive debates, with a multitude of data, photographs, and facts describing an event. This way, practical, easy accessible evidence indicates the inaccuracy or inadequacy of the information published in the traditional media. After all, publishing facts about an event, whether in written form, or a photograph or video as a form and expression, is exactly what journalism is primarily about.

Video clips on YouTube, presenting events that may be interesting and significant to the public, often take the form and character of a genuine story-report, recorded and uploaded – placed – by the man-media. Blogs are not merely a space to write a certain kind of personal diary; the “blogosphere” also represents a scene of reports and comments, once again written, uploaded and placed by the man-media.

The mutual informing of individuals via e-mail or text messages (involving images along with text), relating to the placement of certain information relevant for the community social life (local, national community) or information on global events, is the activity of the man-media.

The space for comments on traditional media websites, allowing the man-media to react and correct the news and information, placing information he collected on the same event, belong entirely to journalism as a craft and media as a structure.

Finally, the oral exchange of information or exchange via text messaging or Skype is once again the practical engagement of the man-media.

Wikipedia, *WikiLeaks* and *WikiNews* are true examples of man-media associating and organizing themselves in an adequate structure, while Edward Snowden¹ is a freelance man-media. The Italian website *Currunt – informazioni online*, was designed and functions in practice as a space for citizens to publish their articles in the following fields: economy and finance, politics, crime, international news, spectacles and culture, sport, and tradition (see: <http://www.currunt.tv/>).

If an individual collects information about a certain event, verifies the sources of information, compares data, structures the collected data and facts into a news, report, comment, story, and then places them in public, we find no obstacle to perceiving and referring to them as journalists. The man-media is both the media and a source of information for other media at the same time (which is, after all, a common denominator for all other media). In their daily informative activities, a large number of traditional media use the information and data published by man-media on social networks, in the blogosphere, on websites, or the information received directly from their viewers. For years, the BBC has been practicing UGC (user generated content) or “audience material”, the expression proposed by Claire Wardle and Andrew Williams for a set of information (breaking news footage, audience comments, photos, video clips, audience experiences, audience information, digital stories) (Wardle and Williams 2010), that the media companies in general, and in this case the BBC, receive from their viewers each day. For instance, before the London bombings on July 7, 2005, the BBC News Interactive in London received around 300 emails on an average day. This has now risen to around 12,000, with spikes around certain popular stories. This transformation has been reflected in the establishment of a

¹ Edward Snowden is an American computer specialist and a former CIA and NSA employee who leaked details of several top-secret United States and British government mass surveillance programs to the press.

dedicated newsroom, the UGC Hub, responsible for centrally managing material sent in by the public. “From a very low base around three years ago, the hub now receives around 1000 stills and video clips in a quiet week, and during the floods in June 2006 they received around 7000 photos and videos in five days. They are just approximate figures for the information and raw material flowing into the BBC’s growing UGC Hub: they now include the content sent directly to individual programs, or to the many local and regional newsrooms across the UK, which can be considerable, especially during big ‘UGC stories, such as a terrorist attack or extreme weather” (Wardle and Williams 2010, 32).

In this case, the man-media appears in the role of an associate journalist, participating in the realization of the BBC content, but also as the media transmitting the information (in this specific case, to another media company). Analyzing the structure of materials that the man-media forwards to the BBC, found in a study performed by five researchers from Cardiff University (Wardle and Williams 2010), who spent ten weeks in nine different BBC newsrooms in London and all over the UK, we come to the same conclusion. The structure of the audience content can be classified in the following manner: 1. audience footage (breaking news photographs and videos); 2. audience experiences (case studies contributed in response to a BBC news story); 3. audience stories (story tip-offs from the audience which are not on the BBC news agenda (O’Sullivan and Heinonen 2008, 363). Therefore, in our opinion, referring to it as audience material is not justified, and even less as user generated content, but as the active engagement of the man-media.

One common objection coming from journalists is that the audience content (audience stories, audience experiences and audience footage), acts only as a source of information, raw material to be systemized and edited by “real” journalists, to make it a “real” journalist news, report or story. Some part of the materials that the audience sends to various media as their contribution to improve their informative function certainly have the value and meaning of an information source, that is, they represent a set of data and facts that need to be connected, systemized and edited. However, the difference between the man-media and a source of information is that the man-media publishes data and facts already systemized, organized and shaped into a specific journalistic form (news, report, photo or video story), therefore a finished product. The quality of such a product can be discussed (the same applies to the quality of products distributed by the “real” media), but this will not annul its essence: it is journalism, by form and by content.

The man-media is independent and autonomous, he establishes communication with one or more groups of people with the same function, chooses the dynamics and form of the media activity independently. Discussing the man-media, we do not speak of a newsroom as a determined structure but an ad hoc, periodical or relatively continuous communication with a certain group of people or other, traditional media.

Let us compare the activity of man-media with the media functions we discussed in the previous section: 1. information; 2. The creation of an audience; 3. articulation; 4. intermediation; 5. compensation; 6. criticism and control; 7. socialization; 8. education; 9. integration; 10. reduction of complexity: thematizing/selection/structuring; 11. advertising; 12. recreation and entertainment.

Does the man-media perform an informative function? Yes, and he does so relatively constantly, using the Internet platform, that is, platforms such as portals, forums, websites, social networks, e-mail, text messages, but also the media space of traditional media.

3. THE MAN-MEDIA AND THE PUBLIC SPHERE

Does the man-media influence the public sphere? We already stressed that the central sphere of man-media activity is the Internet sphere. Is the Internet sphere public – this is the next inevitable question to ask if we consider the influence man-media has on the public.

For this paper, it is significant that the public sphere is viewed as an open social space, where a plurality of different subjects present their views, opinions and interests, comparing and evaluating them in a constructive debate, aiming to formulate an optimal public interest and optimal public goals, as well as specific goals of a lower degree of generality, belonging to the thought and life of numerous social forms in a modern society. It is a dynamic space, with clear boundaries, but boundaries subject to redefinition, innovation, adaptation to the moment in history and the current character of social, and the set of ideals this sociality strives for. Accessibility of public sphere institutions to an autonomous individual, as well as to social groups, classes and structures, under equal conditions, is the key condition of its openness. The public domain, as we understand it, is not only the space of critical evaluation and “rational debate” but also the practical, active and continuous engagement of an individual, social groups and social structures in the process of determining the common interests and public will and in their later practical realization. Such active engagement, existing in the public domain, makes the difference between a public sphere and a public space. The public sphere is in active opposition to the secret, random and arbitrary. It is a space where “social conflicts receive a voice and transform themselves into public debates between the opposed political views” (Privitera 2008, 246). The position of Walter Privitera who defines the public sphere as “a set of circumstances that allow us to form opinions on common-interest matters, thanks to the debate with others” (Privitera 2008, 238), seems appropriate for the consideration of the Internet as a public sphere in this article.

We will focus on informal public spheres, those outside of the institutional context, primarily the spheres that develop through the communicative action of the mass media.

So let us return to the question of whether the Internet sphere is public? On an episodic level, seeing it as a public sphere that is being created, according to Habermas (Habermas 1984, 444), in the cases of occasional, spontaneous discussion in social life, we consider that one could identify elements of the public sphere. Certainly, the precondition is acceptance of the position that the Internet sphere is part of our individual life spheres and a manner of our “sociability”. In other words, it would mean accepting the stand that direct face-to-face communication is increasingly being replaced by the contact: me – desktop – others, but that this type of communication belongs to the modern “social” and sits in the same row as direct face-to-face contact.

Who is the subject-protagonist of the public, the subject of resistance to the official opinion (the stand of ruling structures) and the creator of public opinion in the Internet sphere? All the Internet users? (Stating the term users, we include all the citizens using Internet technology to communicate). Or they are only users interested in the political life of the society, motivated to discuss and debate over common-interest issues and search for optimal solutions to problems? Does merely the “universality” of issues dealt with in the debate guarantee the existence of a public sphere? Can matters that are below the general level and yet important for certain social groups, local communities, professional communities etc. be the issues that confirm the existence of the public sphere? Does fragmentation of the Internet sphere automatically eliminate the possibility to consider it

a public sphere? Or, should the questions raised and discussed in all the segments of the Internet sphere – both general and specific ones – be given the public legitimacy, even when these issues in their core do not reach the general character? Can general and specific but, for a particular social group, undoubtedly important issues, be equal in the assessment of the public in the public sphere? If we accept the fragmentation of the Internet sphere as a phenomenon that does not annul its public character, and give legitimacy to specific issues in the process of public sphere formation, one question remains to be answered: who, then, is the subject in the Internet sphere? In our opinion, the subject are all citizens communicating in the Internet sphere, exchanging opinions, attitudes and ideas, engaging in debates, showing interest in common-interest and specific matters, who become actively engaged in the evaluation of these matters and search for optimal consensus as a basis for their resolution.

We consider that the Internet sphere shares the characteristics of a public sphere, understood as social space that uses communication (meaning that the participants understand each other, but not necessarily agreed on a certain matter) and rational debate (that should result in a concrete opinion) to formulate optimal common and specific goals, goals at a lower level of generality. Universal access as a pre-condition for the existence of public sphere has not been reached in the Internet sphere, but universal access cannot be seen in the other, offline sphere, either. Universal access is still an ideal to strive to, and it still, rightfully so, challenges the human mind to find an efficient and practical model to turn universal access from principle into reality.

Now let us return to the man-media. Does the man-media influence the creation of the Internet sphere as a public sphere? Bearing in mind that it is a phenomenon that is being born, in the process of being formed, with opportunities that will be seen in full in the future, we may say that the impact of man-media in the creation of the public sphere is noted as not too high, but he does have a certain influence on public opinion. We understand public opinion as defined by Walter Privitera: “Public opinion is an expression of beliefs, but also preferences, prejudice, even simple public mood” (Privitera 2008, 238). With the strengthening of the man-media position in the media field, his development in a professional-journalistic sense, the impact of this media will grow in importance, quality and scope.

Discussing other media functions, such as articulation or compensation, we may say that the man-media articulates various interests within the space of his activity and performs the compensation function, that is, he has understanding for those social groups that are discriminated in power relations. Finally, the man-media as a phenomenon emerges as a reaction to insufficient articulation of various interests, needs and aspirations in the activity of other media, and to the discrimination of some social groups that partly appears as a result of non-articulated interests, needs and aspirations. The function of criticism and control is inherent in the man-media, who adopts journalism as a craft and organizes his activity as mediative act, in order to point out the problems with criticism, to actively confront the irresponsibility of the media and the ruling structures. The control function of the man-media is bound to his realistic position, which we already evaluated as relatively weak. However, with the strengthening and consolidation of his current position, the man-media will be able to perform the control function to a greater extent and with more effect. The function of integrating individuals and social groups, as well as education and entertainment functions can rightfully be attributed to the man-media. The variety of genres the man-media practices in the Internet sphere, and numerous websites that can testify to this practice, give us the right to add and register these functions in the total effect of the man-media.

4. CONCLUSION

Is the man-media an alternative for the existing media? The answer to this question requires monitoring of this phenomenon of development in the time to come (which is one of our goals), but what can be determined now is his role as a correctional factor in the media field of the traditional mass media.

REFERENCES

- Capella Joseph and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. *Spiral of Cynicism: The Press and the Public Good*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Entman, Robert. *Democracy without Citizens: Media and Decay of American Politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Gillmor, Dan. *We the Media: Grassroots Journalism by the People, for the People*. Sebastopol, CA: O'Reilly, 2004.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *Vorstudien und Ergänzungen zur Theorie des Kommunikativen Handelns*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1984.
- Hart, Roderic. *Seducing America: How Television Charms the American Voter*. NY: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Johnson, Thomas J. and Barbara K. Kaye. "Cruising is Believing?: Comparing Internet and Traditional Sources on Media Credibility Measures". *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 75, 2 (1998): 325–340.
- Kim, Eun-Gyoo, and James W. Hamilton. "Capitulation to Capital? Ohmynews as Alternative Media". *Media, Culture & Society* 28, 4 (2006): 541–560.
- Lowrey, Wilson. "Mapping the Journalism–Blogging Relationship". *Journalism* 7, 4 (2006): 477–500.
- Matheson, Donald. "Weblogs and the Epistemology of the News: Some Trends in Online Journalism". *New Media & Society* 6, 4 (2004): 443–468.
- Merritt, Davis. *The Wichita Eagle* (editorial). Wichita: November, 1990
- Merritt, Davis. *Public Journalism: Where It Has Been; Where It Is Headed*. Dayton: The Kettering Foundation Public Journalism: Theory and Practice – Lessons from Experience, 25–35, 1994.
- O'Sullivan, John, and Ari Heinonen. "Old Values: New Media". *Journalism Practice* 2, 3 (2008): 357–371.
- Paulussen, Steve, and Pieter Ugille. "User-generated Content in the Newsroom: Professional and Organisational Constraints on Participatory Journalism". *Communication and Culture* 5, 2 (2008): 24–41.
- Priviter, Walter. *Per una politica della sfera pubblica*. Roma: Fondazione Basso, Scuola per la buona politica, 2008.
- Rosen, Jay. "Cynicism and The Faltering Public Will: What Should We Be Doing". *Investigative Reporters and Editors Journal*, Nov-Dec. (1995): 6–8.
- Rosen, Jay. *Community Connectedness Passwords for Public Journalism*. St. Petersburg, Florida: The Poynter Institute for Media Studies, 1993.
- Schecter, Danny. *The More You Watch The Less You Know*. New York: Seven Stories Press, 1997.
- Schudson, Michael. "The Public Journalism Movement and its Problems". In *The Politics of News, the News of Politics*, edited by Doris Graber, Denis Msquail, and Pippa Norris, 132–149. Washington: Congressional Quarterly Press, 1998.
- Singer, Jane B. "The Political J-Blogger: Normalizing a New Media Form to Fit Old Norms and Practices". *Journalism: Theory, Practice and Criticism* 6, 2 (2005): 173–198.
- Wardle, Claire, and Andrew Williams. "Beyond User-generated Content: A Production Study Examining the Ways in which UGC is Used at the BBC". *Media, Culture & Society* 32, 5 (2010): 781–799.

WEBSITES

- <http://www.sk.rs/2012/08/skin01.html>
- http://www.theregister.co.uk/2004/05/27/broadband_threatens_tv/
- www.buzzmachine.com/2006/07/05/networked-journalism
- <http://www.infowars.com/bombshell-kerry-caught-using-fake-photos-to-fuel-syrian-wa/>
- <http://www.economicpolicyjournal.com/2013/08/kerry-caught-using-fake-photo-to-fuel.html>
- www.rin.ac.uk/our-work/communicating-and-disseminating-research/social-media
- <http://www.currunt.tv/>

ČOVEK-MEDIJ KAO NAJNOVIJI MEDIJ

Autorka nastoji da analizira fenomen čovek-medij koji je, po njenom mišljenju, najnoviji medij u modernoj sferi medija i koji ne pripada niti građanskom niti participativnom novinarstvu, niti se njegova medijska aktivnost može imenovati kao UGC (sadržaj generisan od strane korisnika medija). Da li je čovek-medij zaista medij i kakva je njegova uloga u javnoj sferi, težište je razmatranja čoveka kao medija. Shvaćen kao informativno orijentisana individua, zainteresovana za javna pitanja i sopstvenu ulogu u javnim poslovima, čovek-medij teži ka nezavisnoj produkciji i distribuciji medijskih sadržaja: vesti, informacija, reportaža, komentara, analitičkih članaka. Autorka koristi isti naziv i za grupu ili mnoštvo pojedinaca sa istim ciljevima, razumevajući novinarstvo kao zanat, a medije kao instituciju, ujedinjene u individualnom i autonomnom angažmanu čoveka-medija. Fenomen čovek-medij uzrokovan je činjenicom da tradicionalni mediji ne obavljaju svoje primarne funkcije na način koji zadovoljava potrebe građana, kao i zahvaljujući novim, modernim tehnologijama koje pružaju brojne mogućnosti pojedincu da kreira i sakuplja informativne sadržaje, te da ih plasira na brži i lakši način.

Ključne reči: čovek, medij, demokratija, internet, javna sfera, informacija.