

International Journal of Scientific Research and Reviews

Trends in News Media due to Various Online Platforms

Ghosh Sweta

¹Department of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Calcutta, Kolkata, India
Email: swetaghosh1984@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This article studies over the connection between technology and journalism. New media technology such as Internet has revolutionized our information world. From traditional media ecology we heralded into new media ecology. In current scenario, traditional mass media succumbed before modern electronic technologies like user-generated contents, blogs, tweets wikis, chat rooms, and others. Journalistic field has been drastically affected due to recent technological transformation. Technology has been always been praised for improvising the news gathering and broadcasting process but in contrary it also been blamed and faced several criticisms for degrading journalistic standard. The imitation processes in editorial work has been enhanced due to online media sources and Homogeneity in new content “New” approach has been taken in New Journalism practices. In news production, active involvement of the citizens can be seen at grassroot level. Journalism, as an institution has been reshuffled by new technological gadgets. Newspaper, one of the oldest forms of media has gone through many changing phases. Some opted for online network-centric writing style while others went for total online makeover. Papers are replaced by latest i-gadgets like ePaper or e-Reader. New bloggers added a breeze to new journalistic environment. Their free and liberal approach in writing is constantly facing the question of being “valid journalists.

KEYWORDS: ‘New’ New Journalism, ‘We Media’, Participatory Democracy, Democratic Media’ Movement, Representative Journalism, Citizen Journalism, Grassroots Journalism, ‘Pack’ Journalism, Media Circus, Mimicry, Blogosphere, Information Superhighway, E-Paper, ‘Pro-Am’ Experiments.

***Corresponding author**

Sweta Ghosh¹

PhD Scholar,

Department of Journalism and Mass Communication,

University of Calcutta, Senate House,

87/1, College Street, Kolkata-700073, India. Email: swetachal@yahoo.com.

INTRODUCTION

‘The media’ in the established sense, usually refers to ‘communication media’ and the institutions and organizations in which people work (the press, cinema, broadcasting, publishing, and so on) and the cultural and material products of those institutions (the forms and genres of news, road movies, soap operas which take the material forms of newspapers, paperback books, films, tapes, discs). In this sense ‘the media’ is understood as a fully social institution, while ‘new media’, on the other hand, immediately suggests something far less settled, known and identified...we face, on the one hand, a rapidly changing set of formal and technological experiments and, on the other, a complex set of interactions between new technological possibilities and established media forms.¹

The end of the twentieth century witnessed a revolution in the way we work, communicate, and lead our life. The Internet heralded a new media ecology that transformed our information world. Previously, traditional mass media (cinema, newspaper, and television) owners controlled all significant means of communication, but now domination of such mass media is no longer practical. Modern electronic technologies like discussion boards, SMS messages, emails, wikis, chat rooms, user-generated contents, MP3s, iPods blogs, and tweets have given birth to a host of consumer-controlled communications possibilities. Online media technologies have changed the profession of Journalism. In this new media age, “everybody is a journalist.” Journalism comprised of both set of principles and values, and institutions. Journalism as an institution has been reshuffled by new technological gadgets.

Previously, Journalism was thought to “a set of principles and values.” But, now the space in which journalism operates has been taken over by persuasive competitors, advertisers and entertainment tycoons, who exploit an understanding of the new mind to reach audiences. Professional journalists are competing for the same limited, but crowded, visual, aural and verbal space as their advertising professionals, public relations colleagues, bloggers, and other internet-content producers. Julianne H. Newton asserted that journalism has become the extended version of technology. He also argued that journalism has not benefited from advances in cognitive neuroscience and media ecology and urged for a “journalism in the time of the new mind,” which would actively twin the “practices, survival and decision making” together with “unprecedented opportunities to understand how the brain make use of information it perceives”.²

The changing faces of journalism have been part of the journalistic landscape since the inception of news. From the early forms of oral delivery to the most recent online exchanges of information, journalism has always been multiple, multi-dimensional, multi-directional and multiply-faceted, and its multiplicity has become more pronounced as journalism has necessarily mutated across region and locale.³ In the early 1960s, Tom Wolfe and other talented writers coined a term

“New Journalism.” It cleverly categorized the techniques of great fiction to news and feature writing. But today, the world journalism changed. New technologies brought direct engagement with the readers. Another adjective has been added to Wolfe’s term; call it “New” New Journalism. The recent technological transformation has affected the journalistic field in much broader aspects than in past. Technological impact on news media has changed journalism in both ways – positively and negatively.

The praise for technological advances and their enrichment of journalism have been accompanied by lamentations over the role of technology in impoverishing the news. While journalism seems to benefit from technological developments in news gathering (digital and smaller cameras, digital voice recorders, convergent technology), distribution (the internet, satellite), and exhibition (the world wide web, colour print, mobile phones), there is also a sense that technology is responsible, partially or wholly, for a devaluation of journalistic standards – amateur bloggers who do not adhere to practices of fact-checking, deadlines that become shorter or even continuous because the internet is “always on”, sloppier writing, and more inaccuracies.⁴ Recent technological transformations have enhanced the imitation processes in editorial work and homogeneity in new content.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To study how new media technology has impoverished or facilitated journalism.
2. To study how new media technology has supported the participatory model of democracy.
3. To study how new media technology has affected Journalistic standards.
4. To study how new media technology has affected traditional form of print media.
5. To study how new media technology has affected news presentation.

IMPROVISATION OF JOURNALISM DUE TO NEW MEDIA TECHNOLOGIES

Traditionally, journalism is considered to be a profession or practice of gathering information, compiling the information into a story, and disseminating the story as a part of package or alone through print or broadcast media. Traditional journalism is associated with the social responsibility of serving as the “fourth estate,” or a watchdog on the judicial, legislative and executive branches of a democracy.

Journalism is most often seen in decline, when it is refracted through the lens of the institution. It tries to catch up with technology but is forced to do so within the organizational constraints of the newsroom and the institutional ecology it operates in. The first essay by Pablo J. Boczkowski

illustrates the problem of incorporating technology within the institutional tensions of the existing journalistic organizational field. Boczkowski helps us to understand how the longstanding practice of monitoring competitors, accelerated by technology, and has changed qualitatively. Coining the term, he argues how technology and the market have produced a trend that nobody actually chooses to practice but that nobody can afford not to practice. Information transparency and the increased mimicry it produces have powerful implications for the normative role of the media in providing a healthy and diverse public sphere.⁵

The historical analysis of Hartley⁶(2000) helped us to understand the relationship between journalism and technology in last decade. Modern journalism was born of the necessity to streamline journalistic processes– new gathering, news interpretation, and news distribution–we ended up outsourcing them to specialists, the journalists, who could devote time and energy specifically to gather information deemed relevant for the community. Over time the public increasingly became reliant on what Hartley called “representative journalism.” It is representative because the public granted the journalistic community permission to represent the public and its right to communicate.⁷ Such representation formed a gap between the *ability to write* and *ability to read*. Journalists took full authority over the *ability to write* particularly about the public. But now, audience participation in an event encouraged a new form of journalism called *grassroots journalism*.

The proliferation of new technology made citizen journalism possible. More than 60 million Americans own video camcorders. iPhones and Androids are flooding the market. These citizen journalists are constantly exploiting the efficiency of cheap, portable gadgets and the instant speed and spread of Web publishing particularly on social networks or Web logs. It’s vox populi meeting reality TV.

Citizen journalism seemed to reach critical mass this summer when suicide bombers attacked London’s transportation system. On shattered subway cars, victims recorded the aftermath on their cellphones and e-mailed dark, grainy video and still pictures to British TV networks. It was the first time cell phone video had been widely used to cover a major news story. A month later, when an Air France jumbo jet careened off the runway in Toronto, shaken passengers once again took out their cellphones and started recording. The recent earthquake in Tokyo yielded the same results.⁸ The presidential election in Iran witnessed promotion of citizen journalism by new media. The government blocked foreign and domestic news services from covering, but Iranians used social-networking websites to bypass the censors. Eyewitness accounts of bloody suppression of protests were sent minute by minute. When a bystander named Neda Agha-Soltan was shot to death, harrowing footage was captured by cellphone camera and posted to Facebook. The coverage of the Iranian election protest was an example of “we media,” a term that encompasses a wide range of

mostly amateur activities—including blogging and commentary in online forums—that have been made possible by an array of technologies.⁹

Serious-issue journalism is becoming the preserve of specialist outlets. Popularity of citizen journalism is driving mainstream media down the “populist” route. Media organizations like BBC and CNN have created systems that allow viewers to submit digital pictures, messages, or videos during major news events.

CREATION OF DEMOCRATIC-PARTICIPATORY MEDIA

Participatory democracy refers to a form of democracy going back to classical Athens. In this form of democracy citizens gathered together and voted on political questions. Writers like Carole Pateman and C.B. Macpherson complained that libertarians had not paid sufficient attention on the class, sex and race inequalities. These three forms of inequalities hinder active participation in contemporary democracy. Such inequalities limit the extent to which citizens can claim to be free and equal.¹⁰ Free press is an important pillar of Democracy. Democratic nations require free and responsible press to cater diverse and accessible channels for public communication. New media technologies provide new platforms for the citizens to express their views. These technologies also create new opportunities for citizens to participate in debates and discussions.

The political value of the ‘new media’ is the many voices now online. Praise for the democratization of media via the Internet rests on a participatory model of democracy. It is said that new media have created a ‘democratic media’ movement, where citizens are no longer passive consumers of news but actively help to shape the news and public discussion.¹¹ Dan Gillmor¹², famous technology writer and columnist in his influential book *We the Media: Grassroots journalism for the people* (2004) emphasised on the positive aspect of new media. But new media has a lot of negative side. Mobile phones and various social networking sites like Facebook and Twitter can help in catering malicious gossip and fake news among the users.

DEGRADATION OF JOURNALISTIC STANDARDS

Internet as the mother of all disintermediating technologies has furnished citizens with the tools to journalists themselves. It has given the public access to countless news sources, permitting them to pick and choose their content from a near-infinite variety of material. Now, the content of journalism is a mixture of words and pictures people perceive in everyday media consumption. People are contributing to the mix via blogs, social networking sites, and other forms of interactive media. Readers and viewers make decisions and form opinions based on media content, which can be not true in real sense as it intent to be.

For 150 years, journalism has depended on news to take the *center ring* in the big tent of the media circus. With new media technologies, soon the newcomers surrounded the tent of traditional journalism, demanded revolutionary changes in journalistic fundamentals. Initially Internet was a platform for new competitors who seemed to take particular glee in lambasting the gatekeepers of the mainstream media. Many online competitors working under the tent were not “real” journalists. They were acerbic ego-trippers, publishers of self-opinion and unconfirmed juicy gossips with no professional standards. They stole the hard work of mainstream reporters and rarely visit beats for own research work. Bloggers emerged as a big threat not only for mainstream journalists but also for democratic governments.

For many years, the fight between bloggers and journalists raised the question: Will the tent of journalism grow bigger to accommodate the newcomers with new ideas? Such resistance towards newcomers was over due to financial crisis in 2008. “Bloggers vs. journalists is over,” declared a January 2005 post by Jay Rosen, a journalism professor at New York University who writes prolifically about the new world of journalism at his site PressThink. “The question now isn’t whether blogs can be journalism. They can be, sometimes. It isn’t whether bloggers ‘are’ journalists. They apparently are, sometimes. We have to ask different questions now because events have moved the story forward”.¹³

Journalism has to look beyond its traditional formats—even newly formed internet canons—to communicate its messages. Traditional reporters and online writers are increasingly converging under one shared *tent*, where each side is free to scrounge from other. Though, mainstream reporters still write stories that strive for impartiality, they also participate in news and opinion-blogs. For example, there are eighty on blogs washingtonpost.com and sixty-one at nytimes.com. “Old” journalists are called professional, traditional, mainstream, or institutional; “new” ones are amateur, non-traditional, nonprofessional, or citizen journalists. Press Think’s Rosen promotes “pro-am” experiments, in which unpaid citizen writers like Mayhall Fowler (who broke the Obama “bittergate” story for Huffington Post) work with professional editors like Marc Copper (a journalism professor and former contributing editor at *The Nation*) to cover the news in different ways.¹⁴

The *pro-am* experiments aroused a new question: Does bloggers are members of big happy journalism family? The answer is far apart. Some bloggers feel they got second-class status, even they break exclusive news. While traditional reporters can enjoy breezier writing style that blogosphere permits, without traditional journalistic rules and regulations. Social networks can be valuable tools in gathering and disseminating news and information. They also create some potential hazards we need to recognize.

When using social networking tools for reporting or for covering personal lives, it should be remembered that Washington Post journalists are always Washington Post journalists. But when using social networks such as Facebook, LinkedIn, MySpace, or Twitter for reporting, reporter must protect their professional integrity. They must be accurate in their reporting and transparent about their intentions when participating. Post journalists must refrain from writing, tweeting or posting anything--including photographs or video--that could be perceived as reflecting political, racial, sexist, religious or other bias or favoritism that could be used to tarnish our journalistic credibility.¹⁵ TV-news professionals are still trying to “grok” the blogosphere. Political blogosphere reported on the presidential campaign with unrivaled zeal, covering the Democratic and Republican National Conventions for the first time. CNN added a segment on political blogs to its afternoon show Inside Politics, and ABC News Now handed out Sprint cellphone cameras to people marching in the inaugural parade, then aired their video and pictures.¹⁶

Another phenomenon that came into existence is the growing tendency of the journalists to mimic their sister media, other media or competitors. Timothy Crouse mentioned the practice of “pack journalism” as in his book named *The Boy’s on the Bus*. The book examined the extraordinary situation, where journalists travel together on campaign trail for news production. And therefore, they were exposed towards greater intensity of mimicking their fellow workers.

In the current media context, materiality matters mostly in an infrastructural way that it blends together old and new, online and offline, tool and skill, hardware and software. *Clarín* and *La Nación* are two leading newspapers of Argentina. Their online ventures Clarin.com and Lanacion.com produced largely from their respective print rooms. Site usage primarily peaked in the morning and was comparatively much lower later period. The dominance of print material began to gradually recede around 2001, when editors of both online papers started increase the volume and frequency of news published during the day. These news Web sites relied on content first featured in several wire services, broadcast media and overseas news sites.

Regarding the news stories on the front pages of *Clarín* and *La Nación* between 1995 and 2005, there is a major growth in the number of items about the same event featured in both papers on the same day that coincides with the increase in the frequency and volume of publication by their online counterparts.¹⁷ A growth in mimicry has also seemed to mark print newsrooms. *La Nación’s* Capdevilla said that she regularly monitored *Clarín.com* several times a day and that one thing she discovered was that “there was a period at around 6:00 or 7:00 p.m., in which it [prominently displayed] on its homepage what were going to be the main stories of [its print counterpart] the following morning...And if we saw a headline that we did not have, we added [the story to the next day’s edition]”.¹⁸

NEW MEDIA TECHNOLOGY THREATENS PAPER BASED NEWS MEDIA

For several decades newspapers have suffered from massive range of audiences' erosion due to faster and flashier electronic media. Today's metropolitan daily newspapers face deterioration of the cities and fragmentation of the market they serve. The emerging new information delivery system named "information superhighway" offers greater opportunities in comparison to old print forms. Originally, newspapers were constructed by a haphazard blending of different interests: provide current information; keep a record of past; provide a list of available items in market along with price tags; show glossy picture of products will be available tomorrow; give time table of every movies screened in local theatres; give discount coupons and so on. In the news business, search engine broke near-monopoly of the local newspaper, putting every English-language paper on the Web in competition with all the rest. Now not only could choose consumers often get what they wanted from the paper without paying for old delivery methods. They could choose among hundreds of different papers, story by story.

Newspapers traditionally have three revenue sources: news stand sales, subscription, and advertising. The old newspaper business model relies mostly on the last of these. Free online advertising replaced the classified advertising that had heavily supported the old newspaper business. Newspaper advertising revenue fell more—more than two to three times as much in percentage terms—during the 2008-2009 recession than during the two worst previous recessions for newspapers since World War II, in 1991 and 2001.¹⁹

Traditional readers of newspapers are going mainly towards online sources, while younger generations never got in the habit of reading newspaper in the first place. The entire generation of 'Digital Natives'—kids who have grown up with the internet, and are accustomed to the entire world being only a mouseclick away—consider traditional media like books, magazines, and newspapers expensive, bore, and a waste of time. This generation choose Google rather than going to the library. Michael Kinsley (2006) in an article entitled 'Do Newspaper Have a Future?' which appeared in *Time* magazine stated that newspaper houses are concerned about getting people under 50. In this present scenario where a seismic digital shift took place, survival of the print news media became very crucial.

'The origins of the newspaper industry's rapid transformation can be traced to 1945,' wrote Elizabeth M. Neiva in the journal *Business and Economic History* in 1995. 'Before that time, the industry had enjoyed nearly seventy years of relative stability. There were no significantly technological innovations, few new competitive threats, and only minor cost increases. In the words of one publisher, "The whole industry simply coasted through the first half of the twentieth century."

' After all of that coasting, the industry doesn't seem to want to come to terms with or even acknowledge its recent skid.²⁰

Topics like 'print is dead' or 'future of newspaper' have been floating around for decades. Both discussions have gained critical mass first in the mid-1980s when personal computers became commonplace, then again in the 1990s at the dawn of Internet. In the past few years there have been new ideas about how printed words and newspapers themselves will have to change and adapt to a new digital reality.

A computer screen is a gateway, forever replenishing itself either by scrolling or replacing old information with new. A piece of paper is merely a clean slate. Screens, and the possibilities they represent, now dominate our lives more than ever before. From large ones in the form of high-definition LCD televisions that explode to the size of a small movie screen (with a theatre sound system to match) to the tiniest of screens on our cell phones that keep us in contact with the world through texting, ringtones and even videos .²¹ Many cities have gone completely wireless as many business houses offer free Wi-Fi connectivity. New media technologies specially the Internet are disrupting the status quo of numerous traditional media and entertainment industries.

In 1950 there were 1,772 dailies with a total circulation of 53.8 million and 549 Sunday papers with 46.6 million. But since 1980, the number and circulation of dailies has declined fairly steadily, slipping to 1,452 last year, with circulation down to 53.3 million—below where it was 55 years ago, despite nearly a doubling in the size of the national population. The number of Sunday papers has increased, to 914 last year, but their circulation began to decline in the late 1990s and dropped to 55.3 million last year. ²² To quote TV comedian and political satirist Stephen Colbert, 'USA Today should really be called USA Yesterday.' In Journalism, content really is king; what matters is the information. Few argue for the aesthetic merits of an average newspaper. The cheap pulp is simply a vehicle for transporting the news and events of the day, a vessels into which is poured 'all the news that's fit to print'. ²³

The rapid rise of global inter-connectedness has shattered the idea of print news media. People want news in almost in real time. They love to get live updates of any event. Any news in a news paper will be out of date by the time it's got printed; it will no longer be news. In this digital electronic age, print media faces crucial competitive environment. Newspapers have to modify their content, presentation, and format to survive in competition. The intervention of cable TV channels like CNN discovered the ever-growing lust for twenty-four hour new media. News media, which fed news junkies constant information via cable hook-ups, were capable to survive. Most big newspapers opened elaborate Websites where stories are posted as soon as they're written, as event occurs. The home page of The New York Times is almost like a blog because it is updated in every few minutes,

with the most recent stories located at the top. Readers can easily spot the recently updated articles because of the red tags underneath them, showing the time of last updating.

Despite of all such modification, newspaper industry has decided to resist the opportunity provided by digital delivery and consumption. Instead, they mostly ignored the changes occurring all around them in other form of media. There has been news story after news story about decline of readership in print, with new studies and statistics showing that consumers are moving faster toward online news and information.

‘U.S newspaper publishers have been fighting to hold on advertisers as many of them lose readers to other media, including the Internet,’ stated a Reuters article from October 2006. ‘Print readership fell, according to a comparison of figures from the two periods conducted by Reuters. The *New York Times* readership dropped 5.8% to more than 4.7 million people, while the largest U.S. paper, Gannett’s *USA Today*, fell 3% to about 6.9 million’.²⁴ Though, in production department technology and personal computers have played a greater role in news composition, and in the production of newspaper itself. However, these production changes were nominal to the digital future. Newspaper houses are feared of what a digital future will bring in print industry.

Electronic reading means the instantaneous downloading of text through an instant wireless connection anywhere in the world. If electronic gadgets become popular, then publishers would be out of businesses. If the physical object goes away, then surely the company engaged with physical object will also disappear. Newspapers have been changed from analogue “mobile” medium to a digital mobile medium.

The international search for R&D projects with newspapers adapted for mobile newspaper devices like e-Papers or UMPC (Ultra Mobile PC) in the Me-Paper project found only nine organizations using e-paper newspaper. *Les Echos*, *Yantai Daily*, *Hearld Tribune*, *New York Times* Reader, LAT eMPrints, Diginews, MINDS, Yomiuri, and e-Paper. The research project “e-paper” was the first trial in the world in which an electronic e-ink device was used to test a new mobile platform to distribute and consume newspapers in a real-life situation during a longer period of time. The objective of the project was to offer the possibility to newspaper readers to read their newspaper on digital paper in a user friendly way.²⁵

E-paper device based on e-technology offer manufacturers the opportunity to embed electronic screens with a very high resolution look exactly like paper, with superthin body and flexible mode of usage. Sony, Philips, and iRex developed mobile e-paper or e-reader to read newspapers, books, and documents with high screen resolution. Newspapers like *Les Echos* in France and *The Yantai Daily* in Yantai (China) offer a daily edition of their newspaper on an adapted format for the iRex iLiad eReader.

In many times, newspapers went under critics, but a new kind of attack began took place in early 2007. They faced unprecedented assault on book reviews. Such assaults begun when a number of newspapers named *The Minneapolis Star Tribune*, *The Memphis Commercial Appeal*, *The Chicago Tribune*, *The Sun Sentinel*, *The Cleveland Plain Dealer*, *The Dallas Morning*, and many others shrunk up their book review sections. The entire scenario changed when *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution* decided to its review editor, Teresa Weaver. All critics united and the blogosphere exploded.

Panels after panels were held at different journalism conventions about whether ‘newspaper would be replaced by the downloading of the news onto digital screen.’ Scholars presumed characters to be sent by modem from one computer to another instead of a file of business letters. It was thought that the collection of folded newsprint that landed on the doormat with a thwap before daybreak each morning would be simply replaced by a virtual newspaper in a desktop in the kitchen. This assumption is indeed the reality for millions of people every day: they still read the news, but they no longer have to wait for newspaper to get information. The internet and digital delivery channels have altered the idea of how news is gathered and distributed. The news comes directly to the consumers using the syndication of RSS (Rich Site Summary or Really Simple Syndication) feeds. RSS allows reader to sign up to receive specific portions of individual publications. Thus it facilitates consumers in getting desired information without much hassle.

WEB-CENTRIC APPROACH IN NEWS PRESENTATION

Google partnered with the New York Times and the Washington Post to knot Google’s purely Web-centric sensibility with newspapers’ journalistic sensibility. Google’s living stories (livingstories.googlelabs.com) made an attempt to create a new style of news presentation. The union created one destination page for each of nine test storylines, from the swine flu to Washington Redskins to latest health care reform. Articles were written in blog-style. The Times and Post reporters posted their write-ups on page dedicated to a particular ongoing story. Atop the page is summary of the story, which serves to orient and provides a context to readers who enter in the middle of a running story. A timeline of significant events related to the saga was also present for further reference. At the bottom, a navigation bar is present to filter and organize the articles by the genre of piece (news, feature, image, etc), by subtopic, by importance or by timeliness. Each time users visit the story’s page, articles they read out, were collapsed or grayed out. This facilitates readers to focus on the latest news of their interest.

Living Stories is a new way for readers to engage with online content. It is an “organic, ongoing way to tell stories,” which helps readers to follow along as a story unfolds rather than pick

up the fragments of different narrative from different host sites. According to Chris Gaither, senior communications manager for content for Google News, Living Stories indicates better reading experience. Visitors spent an average of nine minutes perusing stories per visit, in comparison to average 30 minutes per month spent on a typical news Web site.

Salon also has recognized the value of unifying story themes. Late last year, the pioneering Web magazine launched topic pages that give readers the context and background for a single article on stories like oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico, or immigration. For both Living Stories and Salon, that means harnessing new technology and paying attention to changing reader habits to turn old models of journalism into ones that fit how people get news today—through social media referrals, search engines.²⁶

CONCLUSIONS

The current study investigated the way new media technology has impoverished journalism profession. The way technologies have supported the participatory model of democracy, maintained journalistic standards. Journalism has been reconceptualised due to these new technological affordances or constraints. For survival, journalism requires to balance its vision between the existing institution and sets of moral values. It is constantly struggling to survive in this new media environment. The advent of the Internet age has rendered obsolete long-standing models of how to gather and communicate the news. New media technologies provide new platforms for the citizens to express their views. New media technologies support participatory model of democracy. They also create new opportunities for citizens to participate in debates and discussion. Amateurs are engaging to online journalism.

New media technologies have also affected traditional form of print media. The global recession accelerated consumer intolerance, roused business bashing and focused on relatively trivial stories. The multimedia character of the Internet is indulging journalists to a vast array of communication activities. Representative journalism has been replaced by grassroots journalism as citizens are capable to circumvent traditional packaging of journalistic process and involved in production process. The development of an e-Paper device is an alternative platform for newspapers. News presentation has also been affected by recent technological advancement. Citizen journalism empowers the average person to become a journalist and share their voice. The validity of newspapers is in constant threat within the ever changing media landscape. The whole blogosphere, news aggregators providing RSS-feeds, have changed both practice of journalism and the users' practices of news consumption. Though new media has a lot of positive side, one can't ignore the

negative aspect of technologies. Various social media often used as a platform to cater malicious gossip and fake news among the users.

REFERENCES

1. Lister, M., Dovey, J., Giddings, S., Grant, I., and Kelly, K. *New Media: a critical introduction*, Published by Routledge (an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group), London 2003: 9-10.
2. Tsui, L. “*Rethinking Journalism through Technology*”, Zelizer, B. (Ed.), *The Changing Faces of Journalism: Tabloidization, Technology and Truthiness*, Published by Routledge, Abingdon 2009:54.
3. Zelizer, B. “Introduction: Why Journalism’s Changing Faces Matter”, Zelizer, B. (Ed.), *The Changing Faces of Journalism: Tabloidization, Technology and Truthiness*, Published by Routledge, Abingdon 2009:1.
4. Tsui, L. “*Rethinking Journalism through Technology*”, Zelizer, B. (Ed.), *The Changing Faces of Journalism: Tabloidization, Technology and Truthiness*, Published by Routledge, Abingdon 2009:53.
5. Ibid. 54.
6. Hartley, J. “*Communicative Democracy in a Redactional Society: The Future of Journalism Studies*” *Journalism* 2000; 1(1): 39-48.
7. Tsui, L. “*Rethinking Journalism through Technology*”, Zelizer, B. (Ed.), *The Changing Faces of Journalism: Tabloidization, Technology and Truthiness*, Published by Routledge, Abingdon 2009:53.
8. Romano, A. “*Why Everybody Is a Reporter?*”, McCaffrey, P. (Ed.), *The News and Its Future*, Published by The H.W.Wilson, New York, 2010; 82(2):22.
9. Cass, S. “*New Media*”, Rotman, D. (Ed.), *Technology Review*, Published by MIT, Cambridge, 2010; 113(1):62.
10. Fortner, R. S. and Fackler, P. M. *Handbooks in Communication and Media: Handbook of Media and Mass Communication Theory*, Published by Wiley-Blackwell, USA, 2014:16.
11. Ibid.16
12. Gillmor, D. *We the Media: Grassroots journalism for the people, by the people*, Published by O’Reilly Media, CA, 2004.
13. Cooper, A. “*The Bigger Tent*”, *Columbia Journalism Review*, 2008.
14. Ibid.
15. Gensing-Pophal, L. “*Social Media: Journalism’s Friend or Foe*”, *Econtent*, 2010; 33(1).

16. Romano, A. “*Why Everybody Is a Reporter?*”, McCaffrey, P. (Ed.), *The News and Its Future*, Published by The H.W.Wilson, New York, 2010; 82(2):25.
17. Boczkowski, P. J. (2009). “*Materiality and Mimicry in the Journalism Field*”, Zelizer, B. (Ed.), *The Changing Faces of Journalism: Tabloidization, Technology and Truthiness*, Published by Routledge, Abingdon 2009:64.
18. Ibid, 62.
19. Morton, J. “*Costly Mistakes*”, *American Journalism Review*, Published by Philip Merrill College of Journalism at the University of Maryland,). United States, 2010; 32(4): 64.
20. Gomez, J. *Print is dead: Books in Our Digital Age*, Published by Macmillan, New York, 2008: 54.
21. Ibid, 12.
22. Morton, J. “*Self-Inflicted Wounds*”, McCaffrey, P. (Ed.), *The News and Its Future*, Published by Macmillan, New York, 2010; 82(2): 76.
23. Gomez, J. *Print is dead: Books in Our Digital Age*, Published by Macmillan, New York, 2008: 50.
24. Ibid, 53
25. Broeck, W. V., Lievens, B. & Pierson, J. “*Reinventing Newspapers in a Digital Era*”, Goggin, G. and Hjorth, L. (Eds.), *Mobile Technologies: From Telecommunications to Media*, Published by Routledge, New York, 2009: 203.
26. Brownback, A., (2010, summer). “*A Web-Centric Approach to Traditional Journalism*”, *American Journalism Review*, Published by Philip Merrill College of Journalism at the University of Maryland, United States, 2010; 32(2):8.