MASS COMMUNICATION AN IMPORTANT ISSUE CONCERNING ITS SOCIETY AND ITS EVOLUTION

Nuredin Çeçi
University of Elbasan, "Alexander Xhuvani", Albania, marjetaceci@gmail.com

Abstract: Coping with major social change is one of the key features of today's World. Such changes have been reflected in many areas of life, including the field of communication. This is because today's democratic society cannot be understood without a well-informed population. Getting as effective information as possible enables citizen participation in community life. Sociologists think that the quality of communication with others directly affects the quality of our lives, because people are shaped by contact with each other, during which they discuss their identities. In today's social studies the notion of "communication" is so prevalent that it is often said that we live in a civilization of communication. In modern societies people communicate in different ways. One of the most important modes of communication nowadays has become mass communication, which in its development is proving accelerated. Mass communication is part of more comprehensive studies of human communication whose study is of interdisciplinary character. Mass communication represents organized modes of open and public communication, usually over long distances and for short periods of time. The role, impact and importance of this communication is further enhanced by the fact that at this time we are facing what is known as the "digital age of communication". The introduction and consolidation of this era has created a much more dynamic and intense communication between people, thereby creating a kind of dependency on the communication process on the functioning or not of modern communication technology. Mass communication is an important factor in the development of society in general and communication in particular. As a result of the changes taking place in modern times, there has been a need for more interaction between cultures, science, language, and other systems that inform and bring people together, in order to exchange social values in general. The focus of this study is to argue that the social conditioning of the mass media, its relation to social reality, provides a functional harmonization between mass communication and social life. The media, as a form of mass communication, is especially important in large and technologically advanced countries, where most citizens never meet 99 percent of their fellow citizens, and the media as a form of creation of closeness to compatriots. Although the early forms of mass media (newspapers, magazines, cinema and radio) have evolved at an extremely rapid pace and become enriched with new forms, the essential feature of mass communication remains the same: information, opinions and entertainment are quickly disseminated to the population. wide, and have a major impact on society. Opposing the negative and harmful approach to the influence of the media on the individual, the family and the society enables the identification of the social interior of the elements of mass communication in social life. Mass communication has its social dimension, fulfills important functions, exerts a great influence on the development of society in general and communication in particular. Mass communication takes place in various forms and has many social effects such as: socialization, shaping people's behaviors, perceptions and beliefs, agenda setting, encouraging prosocial behaviors etc.
Keywords: mass communication, complex phenomenon, social dimension, social functions

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the characteristic distinguishing features of man is the ability to communicate. This ability has made man the most privileged and powerful being on the planet. In today's social studies the notion of "communication" is so often encountered that it is often said that we live in a civilization of communication. But this concept is not new because man is by nature a communicative being, and his main feature is the language, which essentially serves to communicate. Historically, however, the means of communication have developed so much, especially with the birth of the printing press and the possibility of endless reproduction of the word through the media, that communication has taken on a global dimension. Perhaps this is the reason we often say that not the ability to think, as the philosopher Rene Deckartes used to say, but the ability to communicate makes us feel human.

Society, subject to historical reality, is a set of reports and actions in which communication is presented as an objective factor, a condition of its existence. Consequently, many scholars have characterized communication as an art, or as Syzana Lekaj puts it, that "communication is the key aspect of human existence because man is a social and communicative being".

In our daily lives it is impossible not to communicate with each other. We communicate in every environment, at home, on the street, at school at work, and everywhere else. This means that we communicate all our lives, everywhere and everywhere, even when we do not communicate, that is, when we are silent or mumbling something

on our own. But what is communication? The word communication is derived from the Latin, communicare, which means to come together, to communicate, to present, to speak (2006), and to mean to enter into relation to one another, to exchange thoughts, agreement between two or more people, individuals or social groups, in a common language. J. Burgoon, D. Buller, and W. Woodall (1996) define communication as "an uninterrupted dynamic process by which transmitter and receiver exchange messages". According to sociologist Roland Lami (2014) this is also happening "in the still unformed Albanian society", in which communication is becoming a fashion ".

As researcher Artan Fuga (2014) at the beginning of his book "Communication in Mass Society" states: "Society is but communication between the individuals who make up it. Communication cannot take place outside the cultural matrix of society, whereas society is not a solid substance but the whole of the communications that take place within it. Communication between the members of a nation gives the nation, between the believers of a religion gives the religious community, between the members of an institution gives the institution etc ... Without this inter-individual communication, neither the nation, nor religion, nor institutions can exist." So according to him "Everything is in fact communication". According to sociologist Roland Lami (2014) this is also happening "in the still unformed Albanian society", in which "communication is becoming a fashion "

Through communication we express the culture, the values, but also the need to realize them. In a word, communication serves as a process for transferring messages from one person to another. Thus, one of the most prominent scholars of recent years, Umberto Eco, wrote that "culture its development is essentially a set of communication data". The question of communication is far more complex than we think, and it finds treatments in antiquity, but as a separate science, the theory of communication has emerged in recent decades.

Communication is accomplished through two modes: personal or two-way communication (eye to eye); Mass communication is usually one-way and is carried out by professional executives, or mass media, otherwise called organizations that produce and distribute messages.

Mass communication is part of more comprehensive studies of human communication, and the study of communication has an interdisciplinary character. The main issues of communication theory and study are: who communicates and to whom; why it is communicated; how communication emerges; what it contains, and what are the deliberate and unintended consequences of this process.

If we classify communication based on the degree of social organization, then mass communication can be seen as the top of a pyramid on which intrapersonal communication is based (perception, attention, understanding, learning, opinions, identity). On this scale, one can talk about interpersonal communication (for example, conversations and interaction between interlocutors), further on communication within social groups (for example, the family), within associations, organizations and institutions - noting instance-by-step reduction of examples as well as defined and almost closed schemes within the relevant communication boundaries. But while such a separation may seem simple and clear, the globalization of social life and the development of mass communication has greatly "softened" the differences between these levels of communication by creating hybrids and new communication networks.

2. "MASS COMMUNICATION", AN ELEMENT OF HUMAN COMMUNICATION

According to McQuail (2005), the terms "mass communication" and "mass media" were coined at the beginning of the 20th century to describe a new social phenomenon and one of the main features of the modern world, built on the foundations of democracy, popularization and industrialization. The term "mass communication" refers to organized modes of open and public communication, usually over long distances and for short periods of time. The concept of mass communication usually means: newspapers and magazines (written and electronic), television and cinema, radio, advertising and social communication, sometimes even books (especially popular literature), music (popular industry), DVDs, videotapes , computer games, etc. The essence of this concept is made by the adjective "mass", which suggests a heterogeneous public that makes communication one-sided, because through this planned communication a narrow elite disseminates information and patterns of thinking or behavior to a large number of recipients.

Communication in the mass media is not personal or individual, but massive. It presupposes the subject, the concrete message, which represents a particular content, intended for a wide audience; the professional journalistic ways chosen for effective communication; as well as the medium and media that convey the message. In this context, the term communication is presented as a set of processes, organisms and mechanisms that act to compile information and to transmit it to society. Communication involves the technique and technology of conveying information to readers, radio listeners and viewers. It has a complex technical, organizational and creative character. Technically speaking, it is about mass media: print and electronic media; in organizational terms, it embodies the whole activity of the various sectors in alignment with the realization of timely and quality goals; while the creative aspect is conditioned by journalistic mastery, from the selection, determination and realization of forms of reflection, that the

information is conveyed to the audience in truth, clearly beautifully, affecting the minds and feelings of consumers. The mission of mass media, in general, is to spread knowledge about and about life.

Press historians Mikhail Kunczik and Astrid Zipfel in the content of the concept of communication also include the notion of organization (Ozhegov.SI, "Dictionary of the Russian Language", 6th edition, Moscow, p: 41) and the interaction through symbols and the transmission of information involuntarily by the observer, who is interpreted by an external observer as informant (Magazine: "The Light Star" (1944). Communication is considered successful when information is conveyed and received correctly. We say this because when communicating or transmitting certain messages, we may encounter obstacles of different nature. In modern societies people communicate in a variety of ways: through direct communication at home and in public places; by phone, fax and email; in schools, mosques and churches, concerts, theaters, public meetings; as well as through reading, listening, and viewing the media. The media are especially important in large, technologically advanced countries, where the majority of citizens never meet 99 percent of their fellow citizens, and the media as a form of closeness to their compatriots.In cases where the mass media have professional or technical deficiencies, or where they are manifestly propagandistic, the gap created by other forms of communication, however inappropriate, can be filled. At the political level, the media has a central role in reinforcing democracy because effective information enables citizen participation in community life. So democratic society, since it depends on a well-informed population that knows how to make political choices, is closely linked to mass communication.

According to Lindita Tahiri (2017) "the term "Mass Media" was coined in the 1920s, with the development of national radio networks and mass circulation of newspapers and magazines targeting mass audiences)". In a way, mass audiences mean shaping a mass society with special characteristics, and how likely and important this audience can be is illustrated by the fact that the so-called "eastern bloc" could collapse largely thanks to the media. The term "media" comes from the Latin plural of this word, and means a whole of all sorts of publications, in the face of, for example, non-mass media, such as speech, gestures, telephone, mail, or midrange. While face-to-face communication is reciprocal, mass media is monopolistic since reciprocity of a mass audience is impossible.

Although the early forms of mass media (newspapers, magazines, cinema and radio) have evolved at an extremely rapid pace and become enriched with new forms, the essential feature of mass communication remains the same: information, opinions and entertainment are quickly disseminated to the population. wide, and have a major impact on society.

3. PUBLIC SPACE AS A DISCURSIVE REALITY

One of the topics and most important problems in mass communication is public space. As such it cannot be overlooked and left untreated. But care should be taken not to identify public spaces as some often do with public material spaces such as squares, stadiums, public buildings, roads, etc. In the communication sciences the same word is used more or less as in urbanism or sociology, but here the meaning of the word public space is quite different. For example, the same word "time" in physics, philosophy or everyday speech sometimes expresses different meanings.

From the point of view of the communication sciences, the German philosopher Jürgen Habermas since the 1960s has defined public space as a discursive reality, consisting of words, sounds or images where people exchange and debate among themselves. So it is a space built from the messages exchanged between people, so it is a field of interest for the communication sciences, and is therefore a communication activity. But being a communicative reality, public space appears to us both as a "container" of communication and as a content of communication. So in this public sphere communicators construct messages, which when publicly exchanged constitute the content of this space, where words are as the basic semantic concepts that form its foundation.

In his book Dedicated to Public Space "The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere" the German philosopher Jürgen Habermas (1999) explains that from a qualitative point of view the messages that are circulating in it are characterized by the size of the public interest. So they are not any kind of messages, but messages that address social issues of a public nature, thus capturing themes that affect the general social interest, influence political, social, economic and social decisions that may be of local, national or global size. . From this point of view they differ from private debate or thinking, which have a different nature and reside in what is called a private discussion space. For example, a man may like a woman according to his tastes and it is only up to him to decide or choose, so it is a private matter of his own, and the obligation to respect the woman in general is an issue affecting the public space where it cannot be insulted, touched, or slandered by anyone.

This means that it is not only the content, but also the place where a particular discourse is held, where the messages are circulated, their code of structuring, which constitutes their nature as part of the public space. These messages should become part of the public space in the form of a mass media channel, or through social media, or through face-to-face communication, or events, etc., to communicate to a person's society. set as a rule outside of friendly or

family relationships. Since the boundaries between social, family, intimate, often become shifty and not very clear, this separation is not so easy to make.

For a society to have a public space for discussion, freedom of speech must be respected, otherwise the messages are not of a genuine public character, but subject to the official content imposed by the King, the dictatorial state, that is, by censorship. But, as in any other society and in free societies, the public space has norms and rules that structure the ethical and legal issues of public expression. For example, respect for one's dignity, disrespect for others, legal prohibition of defamation, etc., as anything that is publicly shared with others, requires the application of norms that regulate communication within certain boundaries and which guarantee the free communication.

On this basis, Jürgen Habermas (1999) points out that public space resembles a triangle that extends to be structured from three points: from the door of the house where the family lectures take place, to the administration door where the bureaucratic rules begin, to the door of the enterprise where the decision-making begins. coded by the owners interest. Within this triangle moves public opinion that differs from knowledge, which does not necessarily have a scientific character and does not necessarily circulate true knowledge. About the problem of whether or not the imaginary triangle constructed according to Habermasian concepts remains valid or not, there is much debate nowadays.

There is such a close connection between public space and democracy that it is said that the public space of discussion cannot be understood without the democracy, without the rule of law, which have ensured freedom of expression, it can also be said that democracy cannot be understood without public space for discussion, because the citizen in order to participate in decision-making or politics needs to be informed, open to debate, collectively process ideas and programs and structure them through the media, political parties, clubs and social associations, etc. This is where the analysis of a range of issues that precisely relate to the relationship between today's space of public discourse and democracy in terms of new media, digital communication, the Internet, and so on.

Although the problems being analyzed are numerous and varied from time to time, from place to place, from stage to stage, there are some that remain more fundamental than others. One of them is the problem of ways of structuring public opinion in the conditions of today's democracies. This problem is not only a matter of political science but also of communication.

Since writing his book, Jürgen Habermas has noted that the concern remains that public opinion tends to be influenced and determined by publicity, ie political, economic and financial marketing. Public space, he wrote, has a strong tendency to be structured according to publicity interests. This is because in today's global and urban world, where organized human communities and groups are crowded, where information is overrun, it is difficult for the individual to process inherent ideas and meaningful theories. It is more influenced by political propaganda which is a kind of marketing that seems to express the general interest, in fact structuring collective and individual private interests. Also, the media are under the influence and power of advertisers of goods and services and convey views, alternatives, ideas that are consistent, at least not critical, to private interests directed against the social good. The public space thus becomes a publicity space.

A well-known author of the day, a prominent Nobel laureate in finance criticizes one of the axioms of ultra-liberal concepts of the market as a self-regulating mechanism whereby market operators present themselves with their authentic demands and that the supposed balance between demand and supply is met. their constitutes the invisible hand that rules everything is criticized by a well-known author of the day, prominent Nobel laureate in finance, Joseph Stiglitz. This author argues that this cannot be the case because the propaganda made by different firms, that is, powerful operators also in economics, finance, politics, culture, etc., can very well alienate the public demand for material goods, services or reforms. economic and political policy. If we look at this analysis according to the approach that the communication sciences are concerned with, it turns out that public opinion is free, but not necessarily authentic and unaffected by the private interests of interest groups and fails to always express genuine public interests.

From this point of view, both the individual and the social group, society in general can structure a public opinion, thus voting, not on the basis of free and authentic opinions, but manipulated and partly contrary to the demands that would be those that would truly express the public interest. Joseph Stiglitz (2012) writes: "Contrary to the reality of what perceptions and preferences can be shaped externally, the prevailing economic mindset adheres to the idea that individuals have well-defined preferences and perfectly rational expectations and perceptions. Allegedly, individuals know what they are looking for. But in this respect traditional economists are wrong. If what they said had been true, then there would have been very little room for publicity. Corporations use the latest advances in psychology and the economic sciences, which broaden our understanding of how preferences and beliefs can be structured externally to push the population to buy their products."

In his book, also translated into Albanian, Homo Videns Giovanni Sartori (2013) raises another problem, according to which there is a real concern? Sartori writes that one should not think that raising the level of knowledge and

culture of contemporary society brings about a more prominent representation of the citizen in the public space of discussion where he participates in the debate on issues of general good. We have even found a somewhat oblique report, where the addition of well-educated individuals is often accompanied by a departure from citizen recognition of issues that are debated in public opinion. Interdisciplinary scientific studies have argued that the development of science and technology, the promotion and inclusion of measures in higher education, do not increase the degree of adequate public reaction.

On this problem Giovanni Sartori (2013) writes: "It is understood that education is extremely important, but it is quite easy to see why an overall increase in the level of education does not necessarily lead to a specific increase in the public informed about public affairs. This means that general education does not necessarily exert any effect on political education, and what is happening now specializes and closes us even further within specific competencies. Even if we were to assume that having an entire graduate population would not necessarily result in a marked increase in the population interested in and specializing in politics. And if so, the problem remains as it was, because a doctor, an engineer, have no political powers that make them distinct from those who are not, like the latter, and they will say the same in politics. stupid that may have been told by who knows whom."

So, whilst being influenced by science, public opinion, being a collective subjective attitude towards issues of general interest, often interspersed with social, cultural, economic, legal, technical issues, etc., requires a different approach that cannot be given. by no particular science. The complexity of social life, also due to the scientific and technical developments, makes it difficult to structure all attitudes of public opinion on the basis of an accurate recognition of the interests of the individual. everyone. Demos - as Sartori writes - find it much harder to participate precisely in the collective debate, that is, in politics. Difficulties in the proper and useful structuring of the public space come about because the contemporary society is an information society. In this way, the infinite addition of information does not lead to a better understanding of public opinion. Public space and social opinion always remain unstructured, numb, confused.

Adding information does not automatically increase knowledge, and not necessarily even a better prepared public opinion. Richard Hoggart (2006), the renowned English theorist of communication science, writes: "The readiness to have information of any kind does not automatically and without leading to a better understanding of ourselves and the world we live in. The information itself is neutral. It can only lead us to recognition if it is considered, classified, supported. Does knowing lead us to possessing greater wisdom? Of course not. Well-informed and knowledgeable people may lack wisdom, which can only be achieved by disinterested and profound reasoning; an illiterate can be a wise man because he may have experience. Mass communication in any form of it does not necessarily lead from information to knowledge and wisdom."

Jürgen Habermas rightly thought that public space makes sense as public opinion only if the expression of opinions and opinions is free. Where there is pressure on free speech, it makes no sense to speak about public opinion because in this case the public is only obliged to broadcast official opinion and attitude.

But nowadays there is a clear distinction between the concept of "free expression" and "opinions or accurate information". Free opinion, freedom of information and accurate, fair, balanced, ethical information are not the same thing. Free information may be distorted information in the light of the interests of businesses that control the media, under the influence of profitable media owners strategies, or for other reasons. "Freedom of expression" and "news" are two different things that should not be confused with one another.

Making this distinction, American scholar Alex S. Jones (2009) writes: "The rise of the traditional news type has raised a question about the role of news in a democracy vis-à-vis the role of free speech, which is something different from the first. The First Amendment speaks of "freedom of expression" and "freedom of the media" at the same time, which means the opportunity to speak in the minds of everyone at the same time orally or through the press. The concept of accurate reporting reported by standards of accuracy and fairness has come much later in our national history. When the concepts of 'free speech' and 'free press' became a scream of salvation, to the common man they only meant freedom of expression against the English king.

4. CONFRONTING TODAY'S ALBANIAN SOCIETY WITH THE PROBLEMS OF "MASS COMMUNICATION"

The purpose of this study is not only to provide scolarized structured information on mass communication, but also to touch upon some contemporary aspects of mass communication in post-dictatorial Albanian society, which is no longer a closed country but now has to face it. with all the problems that the civilized world has faced much earlier: rapid development, demographic movements, freedom of religion, changing the landscape of cities, villages, landscapes, overthrowing values, with heavy traffic, almost impact violent politics, the media and the internet in everyday life, with a strong desire to become part of the European Union.

Today's public space is said to be built on a number of levels, with the two most important being public opinion leaders and the mass of citizens. This discovery was made decades ago by Elihu Katz and Paul Lazarsfield, and today, this reconfirmed theory, we encounter with its nuances of moderation and change. While public opinion is structured between an active citizen elite and the mass of citizens strongly influenced by the former. Even the media message is not simply interpreted by the anonymous masses of citizens, but processed, retransmitted and alienated by opinion leaders who trust the mass. But the problem is that without denying the role of public opinion leaders it has to be said that they recognize some kind of diminishing of their positive impact on society.

In a society characterized by public pressure and the complexity of the challenges of identifying representatives who should solve problems and who should represent a heterogeneous population at the same time, but with different interests, personalization to the public seems a useful tool. convenient to evaluate and judge representatives. However, the question that arises in this case is on what principles will the public begin to judge? For this problem Couldry (2016) writes that the "image" becomes one of the shortest paths to information seeking. So, thanks to television, people make decisions based on "seductive" arguments and often overlook rational arguments. A fact that makes us aware of a problem that has to do with the ability of the public to select its representatives.

In his book Massmedia in the masssociety on this problem Richard Hoggart raises two important issues: First, according to him in the mass communication society, the mass media have alienated the opinion leader's own identity. If Katz and Lazarsfield once said that the opinion leader did not so easily allow the powerful and automatic influence of the media on the mass public, because it was he who decoded the media message, now the public opinion leader is in most cases a product artificial media. This is noticeable in some commentators who have occupied the couches of television studios.

By not being known they occupy the television screen by night, and by occupying the television screen they have become known. But, by becoming artificially known, crossing over to the media and abandoning the citizen they have become unbelievable by him. The leader of public opinion does not have a strong personality, but he has great fame. He is not a "personality" but a "celebrity", someone who serves as a lawyer for a party, or a political person, who adheres to the newspaper's editorial line but who does not appear as independent in representing the interests of the public. The opinion leader as a commentator or analyst has been on the opposite side of the public, so has gone to the media, has become more media personnel than part of the public acting in face-to-face communication or social media. So does media tautology when trying to find the celebrity of the year. Surveys are allegedly made, and the public gives its opinion or opinion. In the meantime, the public itself has been influenced for a year by the media itself that mediates those leaders it likes and then receives from the public the same opinion that has influenced its creation. The media brings out personalities of the year those figures that have themselves "pumped" for a year of ups and downs. The monologue here is as total as it is hidden.

Explaining this transformation mechanism, Richard Hoggart (2006) writes: "Fame overlaps with personality, but it is not the same thing… When we say that someone is a celebrity we mean that he has become very publicly known; which implies that he is over-treated as such by magazines, the popular press and television… A celebrity may actually have a weak, sleepy character, so it is unlikely to be said of him that "this Someone Has also a real personality. "

On the other hand, Hoggart shows that the leader of public opinion tends to fall under the influence of his mediaisation into narcissism, to please himself and his thoughts in such a way as to refuse any dialogue with others. not to admit mistakes, not to show the limits of his knowledge beyond which his ignorance begins, not to study because he knows everything intuitively, remains general because he knows nothing concrete and detailed, so to turn into a character that in fact it becomes conservative, impedes progress, does not recognize the true problems of society, and above all impedes any new voice that tends to structure itself in society. Hoggart (2006) writes that: "Here again narcissism is introduced ... usually present on television. Podium personalities, accustomed to podiums, appear deeply narcissistic. They are no longer turning away from the cameras, not looking beyond their bodies, but are turning to themselves, wrapped in themselves, their expressions, their social standing, their creams and perfumes, that is, their make-up." But under the influence of media influence and narcissism of public opinion leaders, even masses of citizens justify and build their alibi related to being dormant, inactive and unwilling to assume public responsibility. They say it's the elites who should act, not us.

5. CONCLUSIONS

- Entertainment and information will be presented to us in those industries through multiple platforms: large screens: (home TVs), computers and small screens (mobile and PDA).

- Newspapers and magazines will be web and mobile, while videos and audio will be viewed in cars, in the office, at home, on planes, on runways.

- The phrase currently spread by the media is "Everything Everywhere".

- We will have everything under control. Digital video recorders and remote video recorders allow us to watch TV on our own.

- News processors, like Google, allow us to choose from different sources of news.

- Newspapers and magazines will continue their quest to discover new business models that incorporate the web.

- Television networks and cinema companies will compete with a handful of video broadcast channels.

- Advertisements and many public relations activities will continue to appear online.

REFERENCES

Abazi, H., (2008) Hyrje në shkrimin akademik, Kolegji Universitar "Victory", Prishtinë

Balle, F., (2011) Mediat dhe Shoqëritë, Botimii 15, Papirus,

Burgoon, J.K, Buller, DB., & Woodall, W.G., (1996) "Nonverbal Communication: The unspoken dialogue (2 nd ed), 1, New York McGraw- Hill

Couldry, N. (2019) Media: "Why It Matters", Publisher Wiley

Couldry, N. and Hepp, A., (2016) The Mediated Construction of reality, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Dominick, R. J., (2011) Dinamika e komunikimit masiv, Media në periudhën digjitale, UET Press,

Fuga, A., (2014) "Komunikimi në shoqërinë masive", Shtëpia Botuese "Papirus", Tiranë.

Godole,J., (2014), "Gazetaria shqiptare në tranzicion", Papirus, Tiranë, në Zguri Rr, (2017), Instituti Shqiptar i Medias, Marrëdhëniet mes medias dhe politikës në Shqipëri, Friedrich Ebert Stuftung, fq. 14.

Habermas, J,. (1989) The public sphere: An encyclopedia article. Në Critical Theory and Society: A Reader, red. Stephen Eric Bronner dhe Douglas m. Kellner. Përkth. Sara Lennox dhe Frank Lennox. Routledge

Hoggart, R., (2006), "Massmedia in the masssociety" London, 2, 84, 86.

Instituti Shqiptar i Medias. (2015) "Mediat sociale dhe përdorimi i nga mediat shqiptare" Botues: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung Tiranë.

Jones, A. S.,(2009) "Losing News", Oxford, University Press, 51.

Kosumi, B.,(2016) "Zhanret e gazetarisë). Prishtinë", UBT.

Krasniqi, M., (2015) "E kujt është kjo kulturë". Logos A .

Lami, R., (2014) Komunikimi dhe marrëdhënia shoqërore, Shtëpia Botuese Universitare UET Press. Tiranë, 10.

Mekuli, G., (2006) "Mediat dhe politika", "Mekuli press", Osllo

McQuail, Denis., (2005) McQuail's Mass Communication Theory. Sage Publications, 4-8.

Ozhegov,S.I., "Fjalor i gjuhës ruse", botim i 6-të, Moskë, 41

Sali, H., (2015) "Komunikimi në diplomacinë publike, rasti i Kosovës (Sfidat e soft power-it të Kosovës në rritjen e imazhit ndërkombëtar)" **Shtëpia botuese AAB**

Sartori, Xh., (2013) "Homo Videns"(Televizioni dhe postmendimi), Shtëpia Botuese "Dituria" Tiranë, 100.

Stiglitz J. E., (2012) "The price of inequality", Allen Lane 146-147,

Tahiri (Aliu), L., (2017) "Komunikimi masiv: edukimi për media" Shtëpia Botuese "Naimi" Tiranë.