

By Dorota Inglik – Dziąg

Virtual Reality – the media's role as an intermediary in the experience of reality in the post-modern mass society

Introduction

This article attempts to present the co-relations and interdependencies at the junction of two merging worlds – the social reality of modern, highly developed societies and the media reality, which plays an increasingly important role to man as an intermediary in his surrounding world. The transmission of basic values and culture models takes place today via all the more modern and advanced mass communications media. Therefore, it seems correct to say that it is the mass media which have enormous potential to influence and shape people's attitudes, opinions and lifestyles in modern societies, named by some researchers as post-modern.

The article will present the historical background of communication through mass media, the consequences of their creation, their influence on the social structure and ties, leading, in the long run, to forming of a new form of mass culture and mass society. The text will also analyse the changes in the perception of relations between the broadcaster and the recipient, discuss the various concepts of social and psychological conditioning within mass communication. The subsections of the article will describe the newest trends in mass communication, the telematic media and, in connection with them, the creation of a new form of social life - the post-modern information society, aimed at individual success but with a growing sense of uncertainty and risk regarding making individual decisions within the world of infinite possibilities. The article presents a hypothesis that the media have a growing influence on people in the process of communication, while the modern man is becoming increasingly lost in the global world with an endless amount of self-realization paths. The media's perception of reality is all the more often the only perception of the real world, otherwise inaccessible to man in a direct way. The modern media become, this way, an imperative contact intermediary between atomized, isolated individuals and social reality, the only stable constant of their decisions and actions. The article points out the interdependencies between the processes of communication via the media and the life of individuals in modern and post-modern societies, the structure of these collective units and the social changes, initiated perhaps by the media.

Culture, integrally tied to social life, is a basic instrument of an individual's adaptation to life within society and it has, hence, always been the interest of social studies researchers. What the sociologists are interested in is researching the various relations taking place within greater communities and the influence of culture on society. J. Szczepański outlines the values, norms and patterns of behaviour which are internalised by individuals in the process of socialisation. They are considered as something naturally 'build in' their personality¹. In the era of globalisation of highly developed societies, the cross culture processes of internalisation become especially imperative. The growing homogenisation of culture content takes place not just within specific societies but is more global in character. Globalisation of culture is often considered to be an Americanization of mass culture and is presented in a negative light, something which is a threat to other countries' national identities. The transmission of basic values and culture models takes places through communication, it is a base without which no culture could survive and develop. The specificity of social communication across the ages has gone through many changes, among which the most radical one was the onset of mass communication, a characteristic determinant of mass culture.

Historic background of mass communication, transformation of structure and social ties, the onset of mass culture and mass society

The phenomenon of mass culture or the transmission of content through mass media is considered to be a by-product of the Industrial Revolution. The development of industry in the XIX century has led to telecommunications and then to an information revolution. Breakthroughs in the sphere of communication and broadcasting were such inventions as the telegraph, the telephone, photography, vinyl records, film, and radio. In the first half of the XIX century television was invented which perfected the process of constant development of any methods of collecting, processing and transmitting of information over any distance and in any form. Presently, the computer has taken over this role and it has become the predominant tool as it combines the telephone, the TV monitor, the compact disc technologies and creates new means of communication. The end of the XX century is considered to be the beginning of the computer era², and with the development of the Internet – the telecomputer era, with new mass communication media called the telematic media³. New technological possibilities in the communication area created in the XIX century have led to the creation of a new form of social communication - mass communication, different from the previous in scope, regularity and uniformity (standardisation) as well as being one-way and asymmetric in terms of broadcast.

In the XX century, the mass media started playing a central role not only in the process of communication but also in unification of society. Characteristic to the pre-media era, symbolic communication became commercialised through the mass media. The final broadcasted product, created by professionals, in uniform shape, was able to reach mass audiences and influence their system of values, lifestyles and models of behaviour. The television played a major role then, due to its scope and attractiveness (combining sound, image and movement) and in the second half of the XX century was the most popular mass medium in the world⁴.

Mass communication has led to the creation of a new form of culture called mass culture or pop culture. The culture created by mass media is a standardised production for mass recipients which is often negatively contrasted with higher elite culture (not for the masses). Mass media's commercial character requires broadcasters to homogenise the content of the information to meet the needs, expectations and universal interests of all potential recipients in their free time.

Mass culture as a specific form of social communication is not solely tied to new technology but also to changes within the social structure. After the industrial revolution came a demographic one which resulted in the creation of metropolises and new lifestyles significantly different from the old local communities. There were also changes within social ties. Traditional culture, characteristic of small communities of the village type where dominant are personal, direct contacts based on the principle of kinship or neighbourhood was being replaced by new forms of culture, specific to large agglomerations. These are characterised by contacts which are more formal, factual and specific. Traditional societies were based on contacts and community ties more tribal in character (*Gemeinschaft*), while new societies are more association based (*Gesellschaft*). Weber described a new form of functioning of such societies – bureaucracy, based on formal rationalisation or strict codification of rules of conduct. We are dealing here with a domination of effectiveness, calculation, foreseeing and manipulation which are fundamental to the functioning of this type of society, later described as “McDonaldisation” of social life⁵.

The formal character of relations of the new type facilitated life in heterogeneous agglomerations of large masses of people where the mass media began playing an imperative role in the process of contacts and communication between people based on media broadcasts.

From an anonymous “mass” to an autonomous recipient. The changing relations between the media and the recipients.

The mass recipient was first treated as a passive recipient with relations between broadcasters and recipients being one-way and impersonal. Mass communication took place in centralised institutions employing specialists in order to create mass broadcasts treated as a product. There were no moral obligations between the broadcaster and the recipient (unlike traditional culture) and the communication was treated as a service for money. The recipients of mass culture were characterized as a great community of heterogeneous people who do not know each other, are without self-awareness and unable to act together, a homogenous mass in its choice of content, easy to manipulate and control. The theory of mass society points out the integration of various media into one centre of social control. It is a pessimistic vision with an atomised society, controlled by the media, the manipulator which groups recipients into a mass auditorium inhibited by power elites.

In mid XX century such notions of modern society were put into question. Within the process of mass communication new terms were coined such as: “social group”, “personal influence”, or “leaders of opinion” (intermediaries between broadcasters and recipients, Katz and Lazarfeld’s model of two stage flow of information). Another new phrase was “community of experience” or attitudes, ideas, symbols shared common to both broadcasters and recipients, conditioning effectiveness of communication (Schramm’s model, 1954). Feedback was discovered in the process of communication which was no longer linear and one-way. Mass communication became a process which regulates itself and is directed by interests and expectations of the auditorium. It is viewer satisfaction which is a measure of success and the role of media is to draw people’s attention. It is the auditorium and sources of information (social institutions, society) which delineate media activity and their goals. (Westley and MacLean’s selection model, 1957). Rileys’ (1959) sociological model drew attention to the influence of basic groups (family, peers) and social circles in the transmission of content, treating them as specific filters in the social influence of media. Maletsky’s analytical model (1963) outlined psychological variables imperative in the process of mass communication, such as personality and perception, while Tudor’s socio-cultural model (1970) stated that social structure and culture are the two basic determinants in the process of communication. De Fleur’s system model (1966) introduced the element of political nature – institutions which control, regulate and stimulate the process of mass communication⁶. It was discovered that the process of influence through the media can be verified by social relations which filter, direct and interpret broadcasts. Also pointed out was the community and group character of the auditorium⁷. Semiotic nature of recipients was discovered, or the ability to autonomously read and interpret media content⁸. There was a new trend to avoid the phrase “mass” in connection with processes of communication and instead to use phrases such as “social media” or just “media”⁹. The pessimists, however, still pointed out the mass character of the auditorium and new trends to call it a social group or to emphasize recipient autonomy as activity of ideological character with a goal to weaken the common opinion of the dominant role of media in the hands of power elites¹⁰.

Presently there are chances to “demass” modern societies thanks to the new telematic media which are attractive to recipients as they greatly increase their control over the process of communication. We are dealing here with the creation of global media auditoriums, not limited to country borderlines, by language or culture. The auditorium is no longer one group of people being exposed to the same information at the same time. New recipients of mass communication are greatly diversified, of different activity levels and various interests. The Internet strengthens fragmentation and specialisation trends of new media and makes

recipients more active. It is the end of mass society with the phrases “mass media” and “mass recipient” losing their accuracy and usefulness in the process of modern communication¹¹.

Media as an intermediary in shaping social reality

The mass media today are seen not just as technical mediums for broadcast but as social institutions, intermediaries between the world (social reality) and society. Key is the term ‘mediation’ in contact with reality and it is the central focus of the social theory of media. The mass media play an imperative role in the creation of social reality through shaping behaviour standards. The question is, to what extent do the media, as intermediaries in bringing the modern world to people, reflect its real structure and social trends and to what extent do they influence or shape it. Scientists say that the media do not simply reflect reality but rather project dominant social values in the context of real processes and events. The media “overinterpret” dominant values by stressing their meaning as instruments of social control, or factors determining social order. Representative of the critical theory, on the other hand, point out the commercial function of media and their stress on values such as youth, beauty or wealth¹².

The theory of media and mass communication sees mass media as ideological institutions servitory to economic and social structures, or an effective tool of power in modern societies. In socio-political discussions we can distinguish two contrasting models. The first “domination model”, propagated by pessimistic critics of capitalists societies, sees the media as an “ideological apparatus” legitimising capitalism, “selling” recipients the capitalist system through the creation of false needs¹³. The second, “pluralist model”, is an idealised version of liberalism with free recipients able to resist persuasion and autonomously react to media’s offers¹⁴.

In conclusion, a moderate stand on the above issue seems to be most adequate. Depending on the character of society, the media broadcasts can be more or less effective in portraying social reality, although they do it through the prism of commonly accepted ideological values and are always an instrument of mass production and reproduction of social consciousness.

Factors limiting and modifying the influence of media content on recipients

When looking into the capabilities and influence of media broadcasts regarding the propagation of values, norms, models and lifestyles, researchers point out opposing interdependencies, concentrating on the sphere of social influence on the functioning of mass media and underlining bilateral influences. There is a series of factors limiting or modifying media influence on recipients. The broadcasts are not created randomly but are a final product, a result of multiple factors, social pressures and institutional conditioning.

The mass media only present an “offer” of broadcasts and the final decision is made by viewers. Their choice is influenced by socio-cultural factors, the lifecycle aspect (age, family situation), education and personal culture (social surroundings) as well as previous media experiences. Sociological studies show that people of a similar social characteristic behave similarly and react to media content likewise (DeFleur’s theory of social classes)¹⁵. On the other hand, although it is people who choose the type of media or programme they view, the media also have their own strategies in attracting viewers, there is the so called “voluntary compulsion” which is rather common.

Recipients use the media for specific purposes, one of which is looking for support for their own values (*uses and gratifications*)¹⁶. Therefore, the power of media influence is limited by people’s initial attitudes, opinions and values system (theory of cognitive

dissonance on avoiding information which is contrary to our belief)¹⁷. If the information presented is not in tune with viewer's expectations, he may listen to it but the values presented will not be incorporated into that person's opinions. This often leads to forming of opinions on only the verbal but not active level.

There is the influence of informal, direct contacts between people which may strongly affect the interpretation of media content (basic groups: family, peers, neighbourhood) as well as the opinions of group leaders which can modify media influence.

The mass media do not usually lead to changing of people's opinions and attitudes but may sometimes reinforce ideas and behaviour standards. Sometimes media content may evoke changes that are opposite to intended (semiotic recipient power). The media choose the presented content based on recipients' assumed expectations and likes which further erases the differences between supposed cause (broadcast) and effect (viewers' opinion). Besides, there are broadcasts of different content from various media which may itself be contrasting.

T. Goban-Klas states that the extent to which recipients in-take the information presented depends on similarity of code (language), ideology and culture between the broadcast and recipient's consciousness. This is how "effective communication ground" is established. If there is common ground, then it is more likely that the information presented will be understood and accepted. The extent of influence is never the same as it continually changes as a result of constant contacts between the media and their viewers¹⁸.

In conclusion regarding the theoretical deliberations on the impact of mass media on people's lifestyles and opinions, it seems right to accept the theory of a closed circle of influence. A person's consciousness is delineated by his psychological characteristics, personal experience, socio-demographic, environment, culture and political variables as well as the socio-economic structure of his community which all influence his attitude toward media just as the media impact his consciousness. The presented above factors which effect the process of communication are mostly of social, economic, psychological, cultural and political nature and they all need to be taken into consideration when we look into the potential capabilities of media influence on a mass auditorium of modern society.

New trends in mass communication – telematic media in post-modern, information societies

The phrase "modern society" was used since mid XIX century to describe urbanized societies with a high level of mass production, capitalist economy and democratic government. Now, from a sociological perspective, these highly developed societies are called post-industrial or post-modern¹⁹. The prefix "post-" means partly a continuation of modern society traditions, partly something new. For some researchers, "post-modern" is the end of "modern", for others it is a new stage of "modern"²⁰.

Other phrases researchers use to describe post-modern societies are information or network societies²¹ or digital societies²², where the telematic media play an imperative role.

The new media are different from the old in that they are no longer analogue but digital. The phrase "telematic" (combination of telecommunication and information) describes the type of dominant content carrier (monitor and computer) in the process of communication. These types of media (cable and satellite TV, teletext, videotext, computer games, video, CD ROM) have been developing since the 1980s of which the most advanced is the Internet, considered to be the fastest growing medium in the history of mass communication. "It took radio 35 years to gain 50 million listeners, it took TV 13 years less to do the same. It took the Internet only four years", wrote Frederick Newell in his book *Loyalty.com*²³. This new medium is characterised by high decentralisation, great bandwidth, elasticity and interactivity (the recipient has virtually unlimited possibilities in choice of

information content). It crosses the boundary between private and public communication. Because it is so universal, popular and accessible, we can say that the XXI century is the era of global communication interactivity, especially in highly developed societies.

Because of new possibilities of mass media use, the telematic media, there is a great increase in the transfer of information. Modern societies base on information, knowledge and telecommunication as sources of production and to shape the conditions of community life. Dominant is “information labour” where it is the human mind which, for the first time in history, is a direct labour force²⁴. Knowledge is a resource when the dominant work place has become the service sector (concept of *knowledge workers*)²⁵. The basic criterion which differentiates people is not their possessions any longer but access to information, knowledge and technology²⁶. “The world today is a world of Internet and information (...) The media are a force which drive people to be not only informed but in the sphere of information.” – according to a philosopher B. Skarga²⁷. Societies of this type are characterised by great differences in the scope of access to information and knowledge which are a reason for new divides and social inequalities (*knowledge gap hypothesis*)²⁸. People from higher socio-economic classes (better educated) process information much faster and in greater amounts than those from lower classes who use media less often (differences are created due to their reception capabilities). In the United States, researchers estimate there is a new class of about 38 million people who make their living based on their ability to use available information and knowledge (scientists, architects, designers, teachers, musicians, people in entertainment, advertising and advising). They are presently the most influential and trend setting social class initiating the speed of change²⁹.

Individualisation of social life, uncertainties and threats in making decisions in the global world of infinite possibilities

One of the basic characteristics of post-modern societies is a state of permanent pluralism in all spheres of social life. In societies of this type there occurs a mix of various, often conflicting, values, norms, behaviour patters, customs and styles. This is due to globalisation of communication through telematic media. Paul Virilio writes about an “information bomb” which is potentially more dangerous than the atomic one because it makes people unable to perceive what is around them³⁰. A German sociologist, U. Beck, calls modern societies, risk societies. Risk is considered to be global in scope, unpredictable and, all the more so, incomprehensible. People need to learn how to live, being conscious of this risk, not being able to predict every threat or to make themselves safe from all the risks. Therefore, they need to make choices³¹.

In the globally connected world, a universal human condition is that of feeling helpless and lost. Everyone must make decisions in world with an infinite number of criteria which increases the risk of making the wrong decisions. It is a paradox in a world of prosperity. We live in a “supermarket of life”, with theoretically unlimited possibilities but we live in permanent fear of making decisions too fast and without sufficient knowledge³². A growing need for individualisation of one’s life, leading to a complete autonomy of social life, leads people to look for their own “self” completely on their own. The obligation to create an entirely individual life, according to one’s own project, means that that individual must make all his own decisions and choose his system of values. Post-modern societies lack concrete fundamentals of social life as they is constantly questioned by various options and choices, and the only common denominator is pluralism and individualisation³³. A question arises here, can an individual live in such an unstable and unpredictable world without basing on any higher authorities or ideals?

Virtual reality as in intermediary in the perception of the real world, the only stable constant in decision making and conduct of modern man

Modern man, lost in the global world of unlimited choices and endless roads of self improvement, in search for the creation of his identity, is eager to take advantage of various forms of “expert services”. To assess a situation he bases on the advice of “new authorities” or experts of various kinds as he cannot do it all alone. A good example of expert culture, according to W Burszta, is the consumption culture where undecided customers base their choice on different rankings, lists and recommendations, not having to choose themselves³⁴. One of the most influential experts or authorities these days, in the sphere of consumption as well as others, are the media. According to U. Beck, “the created forms of existence are an unconscious mass market and mass consumption of uniform products, homes, furniture, daily use products as well as opinions, customs, behaviours and lifestyles promoted by mass media”³⁵. Therefore, we need to look into the role of media as intermediaries in the process of communication and perception of social reality in post-modern societies.

In order to explain this new way of experiencing the world, an American sociologist, Manuel Castells, has created the phrase *real virtuality*. He noticed that man in his perception of the world does not use his direct experience since everything is delivered to him by the media. Real is only what is seen on the TV or computer screen³⁶. Less and less are we direct eyewitnesses of events and more and more so we experience the world as is portrayed by the media in its processed version. A pessimist view of such perception of the world was first presented in 1981 by a French philosopher Jean Baudrillard in his work *Simulants and simulation*. He states that people have lost direct access to reality and the only thing they are exposed to are media simulations. Instead of real events, we are presented with artificial images which have little in common with the real world but which, due to media and technological manipulations are more real than the original prototype³⁷. We are losing the boundary between the real experience and a media experience pretending to be real.

Today, looking into the role of media as intermediaries in people’s contact with the social world, the word “media” can be interpreted as something in the middle, or a middleman. The mass media functioning in post-modern societies are considered to be imperative intermediaries between the public and private spheres. The reality created by the media is often the only possible way of seeing the real world, inaccessible to man in a more direct way.

The media are an anonymous force which have a great influence on man, changing his ways of behaviour, system of values and possibly also attitudes and opinions³⁸. Research on this matter proves that the media are imperative in the process of shaping individual norms and social values, and are becoming a socialisation tool for individuals part of recipient communities. Assimilation of values via the media can take place through modelling (identification, conscious or subconscious copying), reinforcement (gratification, punishment), or social interaction (family, peers). Programmes presented by the media change social conduct in ways we do not even comprehend. Characters and personalities shown popularise certain behaviours and social values at the same time. People talked about by the media show us who is important in society³⁹.

For example, according to B. Łaciak, the imitating mechanism and need for role models results in screenwriters for popular TV shows modifying the customs and traditions of Polish society⁴⁰. For viewers TV shows are guides on how to live with advice and ready solutions to problems. According to research, 10% of Poles belong to a group called “my life – a TV show”. They agree with statements such as, “I treat characters from the show as my friends”, or “I do not need to get out of the house to see the world”, or “I have changed my mind about something as a result of a programme during which the issue was discussed”⁴¹.

Despite the great growth of telematic media, it is still television which is considered to be the most powerful type of medium, a source of information about the world, an integral part of our lives influencing us regardless the content or type of programme⁴². “One sees something on TV which has already been accepted by someone, and he decides that this type of behaviour is how it should be”⁴³. Many viewers are unquestioning in their perception which shows that they are lost and helpless in the post-modern world. The modern media have become this way an imperative contact intermediary between atomized, isolated individuals and social reality, the only stable constant of their decisions and actions. Today they have great potential power, influencing and shaping viewers and their system of values, norms, behaviours, and life styles.

Social consequences of changes in the process of mass communication, proposed directions of future changes

In the age of rapid changes in mass communication means, the popularisation of telematic media, imperative seems to be a discussion on the social consequences of these changes. To what extent does the great development of mass media influence the system and structure of post-modern societies?

Today’s literature is full of optimistic as well as pessimistic scenarios in terms of the direction of change and consequences for modern information societies. It is assumed that new media will not overthrow government systems or greatly influence the economy, however, fast technological development will impact the conditions and style of social life⁴⁴.

Pessimists see the new media as a tool of control and power, similar to Orwell’s vision of an electronic observatory⁴⁵ or the *surveillance state*. For example, close to 80% of American employers actively, electronically monitor their workers, parents observe their children, teachers – pupils, shop owners – customers. In the digital era of 3G mobile phones and the Internet, the pictures and films can instantaneously be projected over the Web, with surveillance potential greatly increasing in all spheres of life⁴⁶. The disintegrated character of new media leads to growing fragmentation and individualisation of social life, possibly leading to a disintegration of social capital but, at the same time, increasing the possibilities of social contacts. Researchers also point out significant disparities in people’s abilities to access information which can result in social fragmentation, or a polarisation of society according to accessibility or abilities to use the available resources (the theory of information proletariat – *cogitariat*)⁴⁷. Opponents of the present state of affairs describe new media as, “a machine designed for the production of wealth, power, technical perfectionism and ethical nihilism”⁴⁸, and accuse them of eliminating the conditions for free opinion expression⁴⁹. According to J. Baudrillard, the explosion of telematic media is coupled with an implosion of sense. Although we are not dealing with mass society anymore, the mass, a passive, apathetic blob increasingly harder to mobilize or activate, still exists because it has lost the sense in everything. “All that is left now is longing for the Event, the unexpected development of the hyper-real spectacle which will break the routine of the continually on-going show with a fake smile off stage”⁵⁰.

Optimists, on the other hand, see in the new media a chance for great possibilities for individual choices which stimulate personality development and strengthen social relations⁵¹.

The presented above short description of historic conditions of the creation and changes in mass communication allows us to better understand the incredibly important, from a sociological point of view, interdependencies taking place between the processes of communication via the media and the life of individuals within modern and post-modern societies, the structure of these collective units and the social changes, initiated perhaps by the media.

Footnotes:

- ¹ J. Szczepański, *Elementarne pojęcia socjologii*, Warszawa 1970.
- ² J.D. Bolter, *Człowiek Turinga. Kultura Zachodu w erze komputera*, Warszawa 1991.
- ³ T. Goban-Klas, *Media i komunikowanie masowe. Teorie i analizy prasy, radia, telewizji i Internetu*, Warszawa 2002.
- ⁴ M. Golonka, *Świat reklamy*, Warszawa 1994, p. 13.
- ⁵ G. Ritzer, *McDonaldyzacja społeczeństwa*, Warszawa 1997.
- ⁶ See: T. Goban-Klas, *Media i komunikowanie* p. 59-66.
- ⁷ A. Kłoskowska, *Kultura masowa. Krytyka i obrona*, Warszawa 1964.
- ⁸ See: J. Fiske, *Television Culture*, London.1987, p. 126 [from:] T. Goban-Klas, *Media i komunikowanie* p. 139; U. Eco, *Semiologia życia codziennego*, Warszawa 1996.
- ⁹ T. Goban-Klas, *Media i komunikowanie* p. 213.
- ¹⁰ T. Gitlin, *Media Sociology: The Dominant Paradigm*, „Theory and Society” 6, 1979 [from:] T. Goban-Klas, *Media i komunikowanie* p. 213.
- ¹¹ T. Goban-Klas, *Media i komunikowanie* p. 235.
- ¹² Ibidem, p. 205-206.
- ¹³ L. Althusser, *Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus*, [in:] *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*, London 1971; H. Marcuse, *Jednowymiarowy człowiek*, Warszawa 1964 [from:] T. Goban-Klas, *Media i komunikowanie* p. 122.
- ¹⁴ T. Goban-Klas, *Media i komunikowanie* p. 118.
- ¹⁵ Ibidem, p. 250.
- ¹⁶ Ibidem, p. 253.
- ¹⁷ L. Festinger, *Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*, Stanford 1964 [from:] T. Goban-Klas, *Media i komunikowanie* p. 249.
- ¹⁸ T. Goban-Klas, *Media i komunikowanie* p. 74-75.
- ¹⁹ Z. Bauman, *Nowoczesność i ponowoczesność*. W: *Encyklopedia socjologii*, vol. 2, Warszawa 1999.
- ²⁰ J. Mariański, *Kryzys moralny czy transformacja wartości*, Lublin 2001, p. 28-30.
- ²¹ M. Castells, *The Rise of the Network Society*, Oxford 1996.
- ²² L. Haber, *Orientacje światopoglądowe w społeczeństwie digitalnym na przykładzie środowiska akademickiego*. In: *Moralność w polityce czy polityka w moralności*, ed. D. Walczak – Duraj, Pabianice 2005.
- ²³ F. Newell, *Lojalność.com.*, Kraków 2002 [from:] E. Bendyk, *Niezapowiedziane rewolucje*, Niezbędnik inteligenta, „Polityka” 03.07.2004.
- ²⁴ M. Castells, *The Information Age: economy, society and culture*, Oxford 2001 [from:] E. Bendyk, *Niezapowiedziane rewolucje*, Niezbędnik inteligenta, „Polityka” 03.07.2004.
- ²⁵ Zobacz: P. Drucker, *Następne społeczeństwo*, „The Economist”, 12/2001; W. Gadomski, *Koniec świata robotników*, „Gazeta Wyborcza” 06.01.2002.
- ²⁶ J. Rifkin, *Wiek dostępu*, Wrocław 2003.
- ²⁷ B. Skarga, *Gdzie jest misja?*, „Gazeta Telewizyjna”, 25.04-01.05.2003.
- ²⁸ P. Tichenor, G. Donohue, O. Olien, *Mass Media Flow and Differential Growth in Knowledge*, „Public Opinion Quarterly” 3-4, 1970 [from:] T. Goban-Klas, *Media i komunikowanie* p. 265.
- ²⁹ R. Florida, *The Rise of the Creative Class*, New York 2002 [from:] E. Bendyk, *Niezapowiedziane rewolucje*, Niezbędnik inteligenta, „Polityka” 03.07.2004.
- ³⁰ Z. Bauman, *Wiek kłamstwa*, Niezbędnik inteligenta, „Polityka” 11.12.2004.
- ³¹ U. Beck, *W szponach ryzyka*, Niezbędnik inteligenta, „Polityka”, 25.05.2005.
- ³² P. Stasiak, *Tyrania obfitości*, „Polityka”, 24-31.12.2005.
- ³³ J. Mariański, *Kryzys moralny...* p. 41.
- ³⁴ P. Stasiak, *Tyrania ...*
- ³⁵ W.J. Burszta, *Orgazm osobowości*, Niezbędnik inteligenta, „Polityka”, 17.09.2005.
- ³⁶ E. Bendyk, *Niezapowiedziane rewolucje*, Niezbędnik inteligenta, „Polityka” 03.07.2004.
- ³⁷ E. Bendyk, *Pustynia rzeczywistości*, „Polityka”, 19.11.2005.
- ³⁸ B. Skarga, *Gdzie jest ...*
- ³⁹ T. Goban-Klas, *Media i komunikowanie* p. 203.
- ⁴⁰ B. Łaciak, *Obyczajowość polska czasu transformacji, czyli wojna postu z karnawalem*, Warszawa 2005.
- ⁴¹ K. Lubelska, *Gadanie w odcinkach*, „Polityka”, 24-31.12.2005.
- ⁴² J. Condry, K. Popper, *Telewizja. Zagrożenie dla demokracji*, Warszawa 1996.
- ⁴³ B. Skarga, *Gdzie jest ...*

⁴⁴ T. Goban-Klas, *Media i komunikowanie* p. 295.

⁴⁵ Ibidem, p.296.

⁴⁶ E. Bendyk, *Niezapowiedziane*

⁴⁷ P. Golding, *Political Communication and Citizenship*, [in:] *Public Communication: The New Imperatives*, ed. M.Ferguson, London and Newbury Park 1990.

⁴⁸ J. Carey, *Communication as Culture*, Boston 1988, p. 10.

⁴⁹ T. Goban-Klas, *Media i komunikowanie* p. 296.

⁵⁰ E. Bendyk, *Pustynia ...*

⁵¹ T. Goban-Klas, *Media i komunikowanie* p. 308.