Blog 3

The medium is the message

My first reaction to this reading was realizing the ideas put fromward were something I have never thought about. Yes, I’ve been made aware about how media is used in society, for example in propaganda techniques in the earlier wars or how students learn material differently (auditory learners etc.). I’ve never joined the dots and realized that sometimes the nature of the medium is more important than the message. My initial reactions were unconvinced. Yes, the medium is important but surely what is being conveyed is more meaningful? At schools and receiving a formal education, surely the content is more important that the way it is delivered? This idea gave rise to another thought. In early formal education stages children often excel and enjoy subjects in which they find ‘fun’. Most often what determines why they find a subject fun ; is the teacher. This idea goes compliments McLuhan’s idea: the form of the message influences the way in which it is perceived.

Giving this more thought, children are not only victim to this, everyone is. If you are a student in university and a professor is teaching Advanced calculus. She is disorganized, says incorrect statements often (bit does correct herself) the chances are you will stop attending. Another example, you are at the airport. You see on your ticket that your boarding time is in 30 mins, no problem. But 2 minutes later you see on the electronic board that your flight number is highlighted in red indicating that boarding begins in 28 minutes, chances are you will start rushing. Simply because a formal means was used and the color red.

In conclusion it comes down to context. In commercial branding, the way in which the product is advertised is more important; but in formal education the content is more important than the medium.