Print media history pdf

I'm not robot

reCAPTCHA

Continue

I'm not robot

reCAPTCHA

According to Aurelio Locsin Updated January 22, 2019 Since the invention of the rolling type, print media has been the main way in which we receive and disseminate knowledge. We built libraries for home books, subscribe to a magazine delivered by mail and wrap fish in newspapers. However, the growth of the Internet highlights the shortcomings of the print media. DullnessPrinted Media cannot capture the sound and movement required by an audience raised on audio and video television and the Internet.Lead timeBecause printed media includes production, information takes time before it ever reaches you. Our fast-paced world can make this knowledge obsolete by the time they appear on the page and reach your doorstep. Materials In the minimum, printed materials require paper that is collected from trees; and ink that comes from chemicals. Both require a lot of time and expensive processes to do. DistributionPrint can reach its audience only when it is distributed through infrastructure that requires vehicles and people that cost money. WasteAfter you read the print media, you are left with the material that you need to throw away. These wastes are constantly accumulating in our landfills. Denphumi/ShutterstockLong before it became a commercialized media and entertainment juggernaut today, long before it was available to the general public, and of course, many years before Al Gore claimed that he had taken the lead in creating it, the Internet - and its predecessors - were the focal point for social interactivity. Of course, computer networks were originally intended in the heyday of The Beatles as a military-oriented command and control scheme. But as it expanded beyond just privileged by few hubs and nodes, so too did the idea that connected computers might also make a great forum for discussing mutual interest topics, and maybe even meeting or resuming acquaintances with other people. In the 1970s, this process began in earnest. Related: The Mallets reigned in the late 70s and early 80s; computers were much less common goods. Machine languages were perplexing, and their potential seemed to be limited. What's more, this whole sitting in front of the keyboard thing was so... Isolationist. Put it all together and you have an environment where only the most ardent enthusiasts and techno-chatter lovers dared to tread. It was, in fact, a breeding ground for pocket advocates to wear social rejects, or nerds. Boring, reclusive nerds at this. However, it was also at this time, and with a parade of supposedly antisocial geeks at the helm, that very gregarious notion of social media will take its first steps towards being become the ubiquitous cultural phenomenon we know and love in 2014. BBS, AOL and CompuServe: Baby Years Put it all together and you have an environment where only the most ardent and techno-chatter lovers dared to tread. It all started with BBS. Briefly for the bulletin board system, these online meeting sites were effectively independently produced by a piece of code that allowed users to communicate with a central system where they could download files or games (many times including pirated software) and post messages to other users. Access by phone lines through modem, BBSes are often managed by amateurs who carefully nurtured the social aspects and interest of the specific nature of their projects - which, most often not in the early days of computers, were associated with technology. In addition, long-distance call rates are usually applied to residents outside the city, so many of the ballots were only for local residents, which in turn stimulated local day meetings. And voila, like this, suddenly became antisocial social. BBS is no joke. Although technology at the time limited the flexibility of these systems, and the experience of the end user, to text-sharing data that crept along with glacial speed, BBSes continued to gain popularity throughout the 80s and well into the 90s, when the Internet really kicked into gear. Indeed, some services - such as Tom Jennings' FidoNet - are linked by numerous BBSes together around the world of computer networks that have managed to survive the internet revolution. But there were other ways to social interaction long before the internet exploded on the mainstream consciousness. One such option was CompuServe, a service that began life in the 1970s as a business-oriented solution for computer communications, but in the late 1980s became public domain. CompuServe allowed participants to share files and access news and events. But he also offered what few have ever experienced - true interaction. Not only could you send a message to your friend using a new-fashioned technology called e-mail (of course, the concept of email wasn't exactly new-fashioned at the time, although widespread public access to it was). You can also join any of the compuServe thousands of discussion forums to yap with thousands of other members on almost any important topic of the day. These forums have proved extremely popular and paved the way for the modern iterations that we know today. But if there is a true precursor to today's social networks, it is probably spawned under the umbrella of AOL (America's Internet). In many ways, and for many people, AOL was the Internet before the Internet, and its member created communities (complete with a search profile of members in which users would list relevant details about themselves), were perhaps the most fascinating, forward-thinking feature of the service. However, the real Internet is unstoppable, and by the mid-1990s moved in full. Yahoo has just set up a store, Amazon has just started selling books, and race the computer in every family was on. And, by 1995, a site that may have been the first to fulfill the modern definition of social networking was born. Internet Boom: Social networking in adolescence Although different from many current social networking sites is that it asks not Who can I contact?, but, Who can I contact this was once my classmate? Classmates.com almost immediately proved that the idea of a virtual reunion was good. Early users couldn't create profiles, but they could find long-lost elementary school buddies, threatening school bullies and perhaps even that prom they just couldn't forget. It was a hit almost immediately, and even today the service boasts about 57 million registered accounts. One of the first iterations of the SixDegrees.com. The same level of success cannot be said of SixDegrees.com. A sports name based on a theory somehow associated with actor Kevin Bacon that no person is separated by more than six degrees from another, the site originated in 1997 and was one of the first to allow its users to create profiles, invite friends, organize groups, and surf other user profiles. Its founders worked a six-degree angle hard, encouraging members to attract more people at times. Unfortunately, this promotion eventually became too pushy for many, and the site slowly moved into a free association of computer users and numerous complaints of spam-filled membership drives. SixDegrees.com completely folded right after the turn of the millennium. Other sites of the era have made a choice exclusively for niche, demographic markets. One of them AsianAvenue.com, founded in 1997. The Community Connect Inc. product, which itself was founded just a year earlier in the New York apartment of a former investment banker and future CEO of Community Connect, AsianAvenue.com followed BlackPlanet.com in 1999 and Hispanic MiGente.com in 2000. All three still exist today, BlackPlanet.com in particular continue to enjoy huge success with more than eight million visitors a month. Friendster, LinkedIn, MySpace and Facebook: Biz is growing in 2002, the social network hit really his stride with the launch of Friendster. Friendster used a degree of separation of concepts similar to the now defunct SixDegrees.com, perfected it into a routine called Circle of Friends, and promoted the idea that a rich online community could only exist between people who really have common ground. And that provided many ways to detect these connections. The interface that shares many of the same traits one would find on a dating site certainly didn't seem to hurt. Friendster CEO Jonathan Abrams even once referred to his creation as a dating site that isn't about dating. In the a year after its launch, Friendster boasted more than three million users and a ton of investment interest. Unfortunately, since then the service has seen more than its fair share of technical difficulties, questionable management decisions and, as a result, the decline of its North American fortunes. While briefly enjoying success in Indonesia and the Philippines, Friendster has since abandoned social networking and now exists exclusively as an online gaming site. Introduced just a year later in 2003, LinkedIn took a decidedly more serious, sober approach to the social media phenomenon. Instead of just a playground for former classmates, teens and cyberspace Don Juans, LinkedIn has been, and still is, a networking resource for business people who want to connect with other professionals. In fact, LinkedIn contacts are called connections. Today, LinkedIn has more than 297 million users. MySpace also launched in 2003. Although he no longer resides on the throne of social media in many English-speaking countries - that honor now belongs to Facebook almost everywhere - MySpace was once a perennial favorite. He did so, tempting a key young adult demographic with music, music videos, and funky, feature-filled environments. He looked and felt more hipper than Friendster's main competitor from the start, and he ran a campaign of sorts in the early days to show estranged Friendster users just what they were missing. Over the years, however, the number of casual Myspace users has decreased, and today the site exists now as a social networking site focused on bands and musicians. As expected, the ubiquitous Facebook is now leading the global social network pack. Founded, like many social networking sites, by university students who originally traded their product to other university students, Facebook started in 2004 as Harvard-only exercise and remained a campus-focused site for two full years before finally opening to the public in 2006. However, even by then, Facebook was considered big business. So much so that by 2009, Silicon Valley bigwigs such as Paypal co-founder and billionaire Peter Thiel had invested tens of millions of dollars just to see it flourish. The secret to Facebook's success - the site currently boasts more than 1.3 billion active users - is the subject of much controversy. Some point to its ease of use, others to its many easily accessible functions, and others to its memorable name. The highly targeted advertising model certainly won't hurt either, nor made financial infusions such as $60 million from noted Hong Kong tycoon Li Ka-shin in 2007. Despite this, there is universal agreement Facebook promotes both honesty and openness. It seems people really enjoy being themselves, and throwing that openness out there for everyone to see. Pulling forward: How Facebook and Twitter won web Facebook is king for a reason. It wasn't Thanks to luck that founder Mark zuckerberg's favorite has come to the reign over the social media kingdom. It was, in fact, a series of smart moves and innovative features that set the platform apart from the rest of the social media package. First of all, the launch in 2007 of the Facebook platform was the key to the success of the site. The open API allows third-party developers to create apps that work within Facebook itself. Almost immediately after the release of the platform attracted a lot of attention. At some point in time, Facebook had hundreds of thousands of apps built on the platform, so many that Facebook launched the Facebook App Store to organize and display them all. Twitter, meanwhile, created its own API and enjoyed similar success as a result. DT at the beginning of the hands-on with Google. Another key to success was the ubiquitous Facebook Like button, which broke out of the site and began to appear all over the Internet. Now you can like or tweet almost everything, even if you're not on Facebook or Twitter. Aware of the power of social media, Google decided to launch its own social network (Google) in 2007. It differed from Facebook and Twitter in that it was not necessarily the full full full full number of networking sites, but rather the social layer of Google's overall experience. Initially, Google generated a lot of noise with the Hangouts service feature, which allowed users to enter live video chats with other friends online. At the time of launch, Facebook was scrambling to keep up, integrating the video chat feature of its own. In just four weeks, Google has attracted 25 million unique visitors, and in 2014, 540 million monthly active users. Even so, the service definitely doesn't topple the behemoth of zuckerberg, especially given that more than half of Google users have never even visited the service's official website. It still may have shown the world that there is still room for innovation and competition in social networking, however. Multiplatform Self: The Rise of Mobile Over the past two years, fourth screen technology - smartphones, tablets, etc. - has changed social media and the way we communicate with each other completely. What used to sit on our desks now fits comfortably in the palm of our hands, making it easy for us to use functionality that was once reserved for multiple devices wherever we went. Given the surge in mobile computing, it is not surprising that the most popular social media platforms of the last few years depend on the capabilities of smartphones. Photo and video sharing apps such as Snapchat and Instagram, the latter of which has now received a staggering 20 billion images since the app was originally created in October 2010, exist almost on a mobile phone. The same applies to platforms such as Foursquare, an app in which users use their smartphones to register in various locations around the world, and various dating services. Tinder, for example, currently boasts more than 10 million daily users, each of whom swipes for potential partners based on them roughly relative to their smartphone. Mobile platforms also approach social networks in a very different way than their web partners. Instead of offering a comprehensive social networking experience like the now defunct Myspace and struggling Google, they instead specialize in a specific kind of interaction service that includes sharing public images (Instagram), private image sharing (Snapchat), augmented reality (Foursquare), and location-based matchmaking (Tinder). People essentially use different services in conjunction with other platforms to create a comprehensive digital identity. People now exist on multiple platforms, and instead of fighting this trend, big companies are using this new environment. Indeed, social media companies no longer see the market as strictly zero-sum, or at least that's what zuckerberg keeps saying publicly. The registration process for hundreds of apps, such as Snapchat, Instagram, Foursquare and Tinder, can be completed with existing Facebook, Gmail or Twitter accounts. In addition, a number of platforms allow users to post content at the same time using multiple platforms at the same time. Again, people now exist on multiple platforms, and instead of fighting this trend, big companies are using this new environment. Virtual Reality and Augmented Reality: The Future of Social Networking In March 2014, Facebook acquired Oculus VR, on the cusp of mass production of virtual reality headsets. After sealing the deal, zuckerberg commented on the platform's communication potential, highlighting a host of potential applications for virtual technology when it comes to scientists viewing live events, and consulting with doctors face-to-face. However, Facebook has taken a hands-on approach in managing Oculus VR, allowing the company to continue to focus predominantly on gaming apps, while other parties - i.e. the Pentagon - are quietly looking at using virtual reality headsets for military purposes. A number of medical experts have even begun to use virtual reality to treat anxiety, combat-induced P.T.S.D., and other pronounced mental illnesses. Adult entertainment, meanwhile, has invested in virtual reality for years. Oculus Rift To simplify my point of view, it seems many people high hopes that virtual reality will become the next blockbuster computing platform. The technology already exists, and with the consumer version The Rift VR headset, which is due to go on sale at the end of 2014 for less than $300, has never been more potential for widespread virtual reality adoption. At the very least, The success or failure of Rift in the market will determine Facebook's approach to virtual reality inclusion. Note that augmented reality differs from virtual reality in that it applies digital interaction to the real world instead of creating an audio-visual experience from scratch. In terms of social networking, augmented reality offers a number of possibilities. For example, people can share their name, interests, relationship status, and shared friends in the digital realm. Google Glass Believe it or not, augmented reality already exists in apps like Yelp and Google Ingress. Smartphones are more than capable of providing augmented reality, and as you would expect, technology is the whole concept driving Google Glass's digital integration with the real world. Google's deliberate decision to sell glass at an inflated price of $1,500, however, was likely meant to exclude the public while the tech giant and a selective consumer group - a.k.a. researchers work to dislodge the flawed device. The day when Google reduces the price of glass to an estimated production cost of $150 marks the day when the widespread adoption of augmented reality on social media, becomes more possible. Until then, there is always Snapchat and excessive use of hashtags is almost everything we do. Bet on originality: Facebook and Twitter made a big bet on video and live streaming, fueled by the rise of third-party apps, the social media giants were forced to take note of the video format by 2012. But not before the same format, in a different guise, put waste in any form of originality on their respective services. A wave of spending ensued. In just a few years, several large buyouts - and failed acquisition attempts - have taken place in the sector. In 2012, Twitter acquired a video-cycle platform, Vine. Later that year, Facebook bought Instagram, which eventually introduced video sharing into its own app with great success. Then, in 2013, Facebook made its infamous application on Snapchat, which was rejected by the creators of the ephemeral messaging app. Vine Meanwhile, the video-shaped void on Facebook and Twitter was filled with new media companies that were experts in the art of viral content (e.g. BuzzFeed, 9GAG, Mashable). Previously sourced was YouTube, which heralded the dawn of internet celebrities with its homegrown list of creators. Despite their popularity, viral videos pose more complications for social media giants than they did Left to work independently, both Instagram and Vine proved to be a solid investment. Appropriate Relevant however, still face the same problem. By 2015, Twitter was called inaccessible because of its flat user growth. Facebook, on the other hand, has seen its users sharing less personal information. Instead of original posts, Facebook news feeds and Twitter timelines have become hyped with viral videos, memes, GIFs, and clickbait articles - making them harder to navigate in the process. As in the past, the perceived solution came from an existing product that would eventually pay the ultimate price for its sharp growth. Dominating the conversation at the 2015 SXSW Interactive Festival, livestreaming app Meerkat caught Twitter's attention. Capitalizing on what it saw as a new trend, Twitter bought rival livestreaming app Periscope just months later. Since then, it has integrated Periscope streams into its main platform in an attempt to further popularize the app. Fast forward a few months to the end of 2015, and Facebook inevitably followed suit with the launch of Live Video. Overshadowed by its rivals, Meerkat quickly gave up live broadcasts altogether. Periscope Easy to see the appeal of live broadcasts to hold for social networks. Like viral videos, livestreams have the unique advantage of making viewers feel like they are at the moment. Like snapchat's immediacy, the format can turn the mundane into the unacceptable. Best of all, it allows social networks to claim something original that autoplays now on its flagship platform. Live integration on Twitter and Facebook has also made the two companies more open to striking third-party deals. In turn, after seeing the success that BuzzFeed and its colleagues had with videos, both traditional and new media companies were quick to embrace Periscope and Facebook Live. Nowhere is this theory better evidenced than the recent Twitter deal of live NFL games. This compromise on the part of the giants of social media comes as a result of the realization that they can no longer be relegated to the second, third or fourth screen. They should be the main attraction, demonstrating viral, trending or popular visual media - whether original or not - in real time, fueling interaction and reaction in the process. This article was originally published on August 5, 2014, and updated on May 4, 2016 by Saqib Shah to reflect the widespread use of video sharing and live streaming platforms. Editors' recommendations print media history in india. print media history timeline. print media history in pakistan. print media history pdf. print media history in the philippines timeline. print media history in the philippines. print media history in hindi. print media history definition