

What is your idea about lazy journalism that is commonplace in digitalized world?

Admittedly, the phenomenon of lazy journalism is ubiquitous and its corresponding impacts have sparked a heated debate.

Protagonists believe that with the upsurge of fierce competition in this domain, this occurrence has enabled them to complete the work hastily before deadline. However, I inclined to advocate that there are myriad reasons to disagree with lazy journalism.

Apparently, an imperative perspective against lazy journalism is that in this tech-savvy era, some journalists paraphrase someone's work by copying from internet to make their own articles and consequently, they might offend the copyright rules. To exemplify, in my knowledge, United Nations had divulge a report which reveals that 40% of news tweeted were fake which resulted in sheer loss of credibility and leads only to rumours.

Besides, the immediacy that today's breakthrough technology provides can be exhilarating, but it makes it challenging for journalists to verify the veracity of their sources. Another predominant reason for this problem of lazy journalism is caused by the work stress from editors as they often set up difficult goals to meet instead of focusing on the quality of them. If originality and plagiarism both are not emphasized and penalized, the lazy journalism may become rampant.

On top of it, a journalist duty is to investigate, undercover and report the truth, but lazy journalists go for the opposite and jump to the conclusion by using biased materials. An epitome of this can be cited during Hilary's Campaign for the president, hoax news was spread on internet. Hence, she lost the elections, so lazy Journalism is defined as such.

In conclusion, I would like to stress that, higher authorities should take charge of this menace and expel those who constantly supports lazy Journalism so that only truth can be read in the end.