

Global Reports - Review

The main takeaway from conducting this case study has been the realisation of how much of an impact a slight change of words or focus points can have on a story, and thus the public's mindset or opinions.

Although these three news channels are each reporting the same story, by the use of layout, language and context they've created three separate meanings and intentions. The UK (BBC) report was there to educate, inform and provoke action. They were there to tell you the story, why it had happened and then provided the reader with bite-sized chunks of information to educate people on the matter at hand, allowing for action to then be taken place should they wish to. I think it's fair to say that the more we know about something, the more engaged we become with it, so by assuming and answering questions that the public may have on the matter, they've almost eliminated the opportunity for somebody to lose interest due to unknown factors.

The USA report (CNN) was there to give the impression of control over a situation. The video report was delivered through one closed question to David Attenborough rather than showing a clip of his actual speech unlike the other two reports and the written context provided on what he had said at the summit was primarily that of which regarded USA directly, by doing this they've narrowed down the resources that back the idea for anyone to potentially form an opinion of their own. Their headline was extremely similar to the UK's, however by skipping out on the 'Sir' of David titles they've straight away taken away any impression of respect they had given on what he had to say on the matter. Interestingly – the USA were also the only ones to include social media (Twitter) as one of their references, this made me consider whether this was due to cultural differences, did they need to use something their audience find familiar to get them to engage? Or did they simply see this entire subject matter as passive as an everyday social media post?

The Australian report (ABC) seemed to also strive for change or action to be taken place, however as their approach was completely power driven without the educational factors to back it up, it just came across brash and overall pointless. They spoke of Sir David Attenborough and Arnold Schwarzenegger's as if they were merely there for 'star power' in the headline, giving the reader the impression they're only there to drag attention to a vulnerable matter, belittling what it is they had to say on the matter – focusing on the humorous points of Arnold's speech certainly assisted with this too.

By choosing to focus on three countries within close proximity of development stages, both socially and culturally it's given me the opportunity to more accurately consider which changes have been made deliberately to conclude to an overall point of view and meaning which directly impact their consumers. And quite honestly, it's terrifying.