


Critical Perspectives on the European Mediasphere



edited by
Ilija Tomanić Trivunđža
Nico Carpentier
Hannu Nieminen



Pille Pruulmann-Vengerfeldt
Richard Kilborn
Tobias Olsson
Ebba Sundin

THE RESEARCHING AND TEACHING COMMUNICATION SERIES

CRITICAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE EUROPEAN
MEDIASPHERE

THE INTELLECTUAL WORK OF THE 2011 ECREA EUROPEAN
MEDIA AND COMMUNICATION DOCTORAL SUMMER SCHOOL

Ljubljana, 2011

CRITICAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE EUROPEAN MEDIASPHERE.

The Intellectual Work of the 2011 ECREA European Media and Communication Doctoral Summer School.

Edited by: Ilija Tomanić Trivundža, Nico Carpentier, Hannu Nieminen, Pille Pruulmann-Venerfeldt, Richard Kilborn, Ebba Sundin and Tobias Olsson.

Series: The Researching And Teaching Communication Series

Series editors: Nico Carpentier and Pille Pruulmann-Venerfeldt

Published by: Faculty of Social Sciences: Založba FDV

For publisher: Hermina Krajnc

Copyright © Authors 2011

All rights reserved.

Reviewer: Mojca Pajnik

Book cover: Ilija Tomanić Trivundža

Design and layout: Vasja Lebarič

Language editing: Kyrill Dissanayake

Photographs: Ilija Tomanić Trivundža, François Heinderyckx, Andrea Davide Cuman, and Jeffrey Gaspard.

Printed by: Tiskarna Radovljica

Print run: 400 copies

Electronic version accessible at: <http://www.researchingcommunication.eu>

The 2011 European Media and Communication Doctoral Summer School (Ljubljana, August 14-27) was supported by the Lifelong Learning Programme Erasmus Intensive Programme project (grant agreement reference number: 2010-7242), the University of Ljubljana – the Department of Media and Communication Studies and the Faculty of Social Sciences, a consortium of 22 universities, and the Slovene Communication Association. Affiliated partners of the programme were the European Communication Research and Education Association (ECREA), the Finnish National Research School, and COST Action IS0906 Transforming Audiences, Transforming Societies. The publishing of this book was supported by the Slovene Communication Association and the European Communication Research and Education Association (ECREA).

CIP - Kataložni zapis o publikaciji
Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica, Ljubljana

316.77(082)

ECREA European Media and Communication Doctoral Summer School (2011
; Ljubljana)

Critical perspectives on the European mediasphere [Elektronski
vir] : the intellectual work of the 2011 ECREA European Media and
Communication Doctoral Summer School, [Ljubljana, 14 - 27 August] /
[edited by Ilija Tomanić Trivundža ... [et al.] ; photographs
Ilija Tomanić Trivundža ... et al.]. - El. knjiga. - Ljubljana :
Faculty of Social Sciences, 2011. - (The researching and teaching
communication series (Online), ISSN 1736-4752)

Način dostopa (URL): <http://www.researchingcommunication.eu>

ISBN 978-961-235-583-8 (pdf)

1. Gl. stv. nasl. 2. Tomanić Trivundža, Ilija, 1974-

260946432

<http://www.fdv.uni-lj.si/zalozba/>

Mediation and Resistance

Bart Cammaerts

In this chapter, I will attempt to bridge social movement theory and mediation theory, thereby answering Downing's (2008) call to connect the field of political science with that of media and communication studies. As it becomes apparent that we are more and more immersed in an ultra-saturated media and communication environment, or, as some say, ecology, the media and communication practices of activists and (self-)representations of resistance have come to the foreground.

It is argued here, however, that attempts to make sense of media and communication for activism and resistance have hitherto been too unevenly focused on either mainstream media representations or the use of ICTs and the role of cyberspace for activists. This goes against evidence from fieldwork where activists use mainstream, movement, online and offline media interchangeably for a variety of purposes (McCurdy, 2010). This highlights the need to theoretically encompass the various ways in which media and communication are of relevance to activists and to resistance practices in expressing this multimedia mode and age.

1. MEDIATION AS MORE THAN REPRESENTATION

Mediation as a theoretical construct, not to be confused with mediatization (see Krotz, 2008), attempts to conceptually grasp as well as complicate the interactions between various analytical dichotomies, such as the public and the private, the producer of content and the user/audience, and, crucially, between structure and agency (see Martín-Barbero, 1993; Thompson, 1995; Silverstone, 2002). Thumim (2009: 619) summarises mediation as follows:

The conceptual space delineated by the notion of mediation process encapsulates both the detail of specific instances of production, text and reception, and the broader contexts of media use...

Places of mediation refer to both the sites of production and sites of reception, in essence theorising the connection and interaction between both (Couldry, 2004: 119).

While the process of mediation is inherently dialectical – negotiating potential opportunities and structural constraints, production and appropriation, it is also asymmetrical and uneven – some are more equal than others (Silverstone, 2002: 762). Unsurprisingly, then, at the centre of mediation is power, mainly conceived as symbolic power (Thompson, 1995: 17). This not only refers to the power of representation and the technical skills to be able to produce and transmit information, but likewise to skills enabling individuals to assess information critically, to select and make sense of information. Furthermore, symbolic power, Thompson (1995: 134-148) argues, is precisely about the ‘management of visibility’ and a ‘struggle for recognition’, which ties in with a presence and voice in the mainstream audio-visual media as well as being visible as a movement through independent channels of communication.

The process of mediation therefore involves and includes modes of self-mediation. Mediated power should, however, not simply be reduced to discursive power alone, as it also has salience with regard to mobilisation, organisation, recruitment and direct action. Here the double articulation of mediation, as put forward by Silverstone (1994), is useful. Processes of mediation apply just as much to media as a material object with reference to technology and the everyday as it does to the symbolic, the discursive, with reference to Gramsci’s ideological war of position (Livingstone, 2007). This double articulation of mediation enables us to consider media and the production of content in conjunction with technology, as well as communication strategies and the media practices of citizens and activists.

From this brief introduction to the concept of mediation, it becomes apparent that mediation enables us to link up various ways in which media and communication are relevant to resistance and to activism; the framing practices by mainstream media and political elites, the self-representations by activists, the use, appropriation and adaptation of ICTs by activists and citizens to mobilise for and organise direct action, as well as media and communication practices that constitute mediated resistance in its own right. It captures the shaping of representations in the interaction between production, text and reception, and also goes beyond the text by including the role of technologies and the user.

2. OPPORTUNITY STRUCTURES FOR RESISTANCE

In social movement literature, the concept of 'political opportunity structure' is very prominent. It refers to the '[d]imensions of the political environment that provide incentives for people to undertake collective action by affecting their expectations for success or failure' (Tarrow, 1994: 85). It attempts to explain which structural aspects of the external world, outside the control of activists, affect the development and success of social movements (Meyer and Minkoff, 2004).

This touches upon another debate amongst social movement scholars, between those adhering to the political process approach, foregrounding political opportunity structure and mostly focusing on historical large-scale political movements, and those inspired by constructivism and advocating a cultural approach, emphasising culture and identity and focusing on more fluid open movements that are political in a broad sense rather than predominantly class-based. The neglect of culture and the lack of a proper account for agency in favor of structural characteristics are prevalent in other disciplines as well, but, from a culturalist perspective, Jasper and Goodwin (1999: 122) argue that 'this distortion is especially problematic in the study of politics and protest, which contain a great deal of intention and will, strategy and choice, desire and fantasy'.


Koopmans (1999: 102), a political process scholar himself, might offer us a potential way out of this, overcoming the stark contradiction between structure and agency, between process and culture, much in the same way as mediation does. He argues that accounting for structures does not deny the potential for agency or even sudden change: 'When we say "opportunity structure," we just say that not all of opportunity is agency, but that some of it is structured'.

Media and communication usually feature among the peripheral factors that influence the degree of political opportunity for a social movement to succeed. However, some social movement scholars, addressing the role of media and of communication strategies for social movements in greater depth, have stressed the importance for social movements of positive exposure in the mainstream media. The extent to which movements are able to get their message across in the mainstream media or not, their degree of cultural influence in the public sphere, could be described as the *media opportunity structure*. Following on from this, the conceptualisation of a *discursive opportunity structure*, analytically semi-separate from the

political opportunity structure, has been gaining strength (Ferree et al., 2002; Polletta, 2004; Koopmans, 2004; McCammon, et al., 2007). Besides this, while not described as such in the literature, we can also discern a *networked opportunity structure* that has been invoked since the end of the 1990s, pointing to the impact of ICTs and networks on the ability of movements to organise and mobilise (transnationally), to recruit, to coordinate actions and to disseminate counter-frames independent from the mainstream media (Keck and Sikkink, 1998; van de Donk, et al., 2004; della Porta and Tarrow, 2005).

What is being proposed here is the adoption of the mediation opportunity structure as an overarching concept, semi-independent from the political opportunity structure, and consisting of the media opportunity structure, the discursive opportunity structure and the networked opportunity structure (cf. Figure 1). Inevitably the relationship between these three interrelated opportunity structures is circular and partially overlapping – they each impact on each other in various ways.

Figure 1: Mediation opportunity structure



2.1 THE MEDIA OPPORTUNITY STRUCTURE

Media are not neutral actors; they are embedded in a socio-economic and political context. As a result of this, in social movement literature, the relevance of media and communication is often reduced to being a part of the political opportunity structure – the outside world that enables social movements to emerge, but also constrains them. Media and communication infrastructures were largely seen as circumstantial and instrumental, a resource among others in struggles of social change.

Gamson and Wolfsfeld (1993) represent an early exception in this regard as they made media central to their research, identifying opportunities and constraints that are specific to the media. They concluded that social movements use and need the media for three distinct purposes: (1) to mobilise for political support, (2) to legitimate and validate their claims in the mainstream public sphere and (3) to broaden the scope of conflicts beyond the like-minded. In addition to this, they argued that the nature of the coverage determines the public's perception of the movement and its goals. It is thus in the protest movements' interest to ensure they receive 'positive' coverage. Gamson and Wolfsfeld (1993: 166) do have a point when they state that: 'most of the people [social movements] wish to reach are part of the mass media gallery, while many are missed by movement-oriented outlets'.

Obtaining access to the mainstream media, influencing the public sphere, articulating alternatives and receiving positive exposure from the media are not that straightforward for activists and protest movements, due to the stiff competition for attention from a diverse and wide spectrum of causes and organisations and the gate-keeping role the media fulfil in a democracy. Journalists are prime actors in this. While being a mediating force in the mainstream public sphere, they also have to cope with both internal and external pressures. This inevitably brings the concept of media power and ownership into play (Herman and Chomsky, 1988; McChesney, 2008).

Halloran *et al.* (1970) concluded many decades ago that UK media employ an inferential structure of bias against protest and activism, primarily focusing on incidents of violence rather than on the large majority of peaceful demonstrators, the causes they promote or the messages they try to convey. Gitlin (1980) found similar patterns in the US, as did the Glasgow Media Group in relation to the reporting of UK-based industrial action in

the 1980s. Eldridge (1995: 212) argues that what is being presented as neutral reporting is in fact 'an array of codes and practices which effectively rest upon a cultural imperative to hear the causes of disputes in one way rather than another'. Media are, in other words, 'not neutral unselective recorders of events' (Oliver and Maney, 2000: 464). It is thus unsurprising that this post-Althusserian perspective of the media as being an ideological apparatus dominated by state and capitalist interests and structurally biased against social and protest movements is also very prevalent in activist circles (McCurdy, 2010).

The main critique directed against the propaganda and hegemonic models is that they assume a passive public, uncritically receiving and uniformly decoding messages distributed by the mass media. Furthermore, while many mainstream media organisations do conform to the analysis of the critical neo-Marxist tradition in media studies, not all mainstream media are at all times docile actors in the service of state and/or capitalist interests, as suggested by the propaganda model. As argued elsewhere (Cammaerts, 2007; Cammaerts and Carpentier, 2009), some mainstream media do at times report favourably on social movements or promote a progressive cause. The mainstream media is, in other words, not always exclusively negative towards social movements, protest and direct action. Cottle (2008: 5) observes in this regard that

much has changed since earlier studies documented how the mainstream news media invariably report protests and demonstrations through a dominant law and (dis)order frame, labeling protesters as deviant, spectacle and violence

The argument here is not that such emancipatory fissures within the mainstream media are systematic or without inherent problems, but that it would be wrong to depict the entirety of mainstream media as monolithic or as by definition absolutely opposed to citizen and public interests.

2.2 DISCURSIVE OPPORTUNITY STRUCTURE

The role of the discursive in resistance has been ignored for many years as an important 'medium of social conflict and symbolic struggle' (Koopmans and Statham, 1999: 205). Media and communication, it is argued, have become a constitutive part of a discursive opportunity structure with its own logics, institutions and rules (McCammon, *et al.*, 2007). A potent illustration of the growing importance of discourse in the study of social movements and protest is the attention paid in the literature to framing

strategies, which are deemed not only relevant for ideological positioning, but are also affecting recruitment, mobilisation and the degree of readiness for action (Snow and Benford, 1988). In relation to protest movements, Goodwin and Jasper (2003: 52) point out that

[i]n order to attract people to join and remain committed to a movement, its issues must be presented or 'framed' so that they fit or resonate with the beliefs, feelings and desires of potential recruits [...] Frames are simplifying devices that help us understand and organizing the complexities of the world.

The implications of frames and frames for protest movements are, according to McAdam (2005: 119), that they have to contend with six strategic challenges if they are really aiming to become 'a force for social change'. The first challenges are *inward-looking*: recruiting core activists, sustaining the movement and building collective identities. The four other challenges for activists can be characterised as more *outward-looking*: attracting attention in the mainstream media, mobilising beyond those already convinced, overcoming social control as well as possible repression, and, finally, 'shap[ing] public policy and state action' (McAdam, *ibid.*).

Most social movement literature has tended to focus primarily on outward-looking strategies, such as mainstream media framing or resonance – the importance of getting movement frames into the mainstream media (cf. the media opportunity structure). As Downing (2008: 42) observes in relation to Gamson's overview of media and social movements, 'it seems distinctly odd that the framing activities of social movements' own media, whether internally or externally directed or both, are so comprehensively off the map'. Indeed, the recent surge in academic attention for various forms of alternative movement media and communication practices by activists must be credited mainly to media and communication scholars such as Cottle (2000), Downing *et al.* (2001) and Atton (2002), to name but a few.

Another important facet of the process of self-mediation relates to the production of protest artifacts, which has become much easier and more cost-efficient due to the pervasiveness of digital photo and video recording devices (Baringhorst, 2008: 82-3). This has led protesters to photograph and film what they are seeing and experiencing, subsequently posting everything on social network platforms, sometimes even in real time, and thereby producing an ever expanding archive of images and self-representations of protest events.

The material and permanent nature of these protest artifacts enables symbols and discourses embedded in them to be culturally transmitted on a long-term basis, feeding the struggle and contributing to the construction of a collective memory of protest (Melucci, 1996). In doing so, they effectively become 'epistemic communities' (Lipschutz, 2005), transferring knowledge and potentially influencing other movements through what is called 'movement spillover' (Meyer and Whittier, 1994). The protests in Tunisia spreading to other Arab countries such as Egypt and Libya are a vivid illustration of this particular mediation opportunity.

2.3. NETWORKED OPPORTUNITY STRUCTURE

Just like media, technology is not neutral either; at the same time, it is argued that its introduction into society leads to a process of negotiation. This process of negotiation involves strategies of resistance from users, either through the rejection of technology or through the reconfiguration of innovative user patterns unforeseen by the developers of the technology. As Williams (1997: 328) points out:

Although the designer may seek to prefigure the user – and thus implicitly constrain the ways a product is used – the final user still retains flexibility in the meanings they attribute to technology [...] This often involves innovation by the consumer – using technology in ways not anticipated by the designer.

Relevant recent examples of this in the context of activism are the use of text messaging, Twitter or Facebook to mobilise for direct action, to garner support, to recruit active members or to facilitate on-the-spot coordination of offline direct action. In this regard, increased lay knowledge of how media and technology operate, reminiscent of Liebes and Katz's (1990) 'playful awareness', has become more commonplace, and this is certainly the case amongst political activists and their relationship with technology and media.

Networks are deemed to be highly beneficial in terms of transnational mobilisation and organisation (Norris, 2001; della Porta and Tarrow, 2005). Not only has it become obvious that transnationalisation has been greatly simplified. The internet has also enabled new organisational structures to emerge and expanded the repertoire of contentious action organised by protest movements by making mobilisation, independent content dissemination and the archiving of resistance more time- and cost-efficient and exploiting the strength of weak ties inherent to networks (Haythornthwaite, 2005).

However, an over-emphasis on the internet as a platform risks obscuring the increased importance and use of mobile networks and text messaging to facilitate, organise and coordinate protest on the spot (Hermanns, 2008), as well as more traditional media such as radio, pamphlets or street art. Furthermore, in recent years, market-based social networking sites such as Facebook, Twitter and YouTube have emerged as powerful tools for activists and movements to distribute counter-narratives and to facilitate mass mobilisation; a potent example of the social shaping of technology (Kavada, 2010). During the 2010 UK student protests, the instant communication opportunity Twitter offered was used extensively by protesters to keep track of police movements and to avoid being 'kettled' or contained. At the same time, the use of market-based platforms holds certain risks, certainly for radical activists, as WikiLeaks, Anonymous and other (h)ac(k)tivists have been finding out in recent years.

Communication resistance practices are thus not merely limited to the use of media and communication as discursive weapons, nor can the use of ICTs by activists be reduced to being merely instrumental to direct action in the offline world. ICTs have also become direct action in their own right, as hacktivist tactics or even the Free and Open Source Movement demonstrate (Jordan and Taylor, 2004; Söderberg, 2007). In addition to this, the pervasiveness of handheld cameras in the hands of protesters also enables so-called *sousveillance* tactics – surveilling the surveillers or bottom-up surveillance by the citizen/activist on the state or public figures. *Sousveillance* is the result of what Mathiesen (1997) calls the *synoptic viewer society*, the many watching the few. Filming and photographing police behaviour during demonstrations is mainly employed as a counter-tactic to expose police violence.

Furthermore, internet-mediated mobilisation practices, such as petitions or joining a Facebook group, also enable more passive forms of engagement and participation, which is critiqued by some as *click- or slack-tivism* (Morozov, 2009). However, by using the strength of weak ties, protest movements can garner large-scale public support, construct collective identities and connect directly with potential sympathisers (Kavada, 2010). Such forms of lazy participation could be seen as insignificant or as an all too easy way of pledging support for something without bearing the consequences, but they are highly relevant in terms of mediation, as they seem to resonate with many citizens who often fail to make time in their everyday lives for active activism.

3. CONCLUSION

It is argued here that the process of mediation, involving issues of media power, representation, agency, communication strategies and tactics by different actors, as well as the impact of all this on reception and decoding, is most suited to encompass the various ways in which media and communication are relevant to protest movements and to resistance practices. The mediation opportunity structure, in its various articulations as media, discourse and network, has become a constitutive part of the success or failure of a protest movement, each with their own logics, dynamics, institutions and rules of engagement. The mediated opportunity structure, furthermore, points to the potential for audiences, users and citizens to resist dominant frames, appropriate ICTs in their everyday lives and become producers of media themselves.

Protest and the tactics deployed in order to voice dissent cannot be analysed in isolation from broader multi-dimensional societal forces, from the counter-reactions of plural elites, and from their mainstream media representations through to the discursive struggles that underpin them. As such, the mediation opportunity structure is clearly enmeshed with the political opportunity structure, but there is certainly a case to be made for the distinct nature of the mediation opportunity structure as not only facilitative or instrumental, but also constitutive of direct action. It both enables and closes down opportunities for resistance, and activists increasingly take this into account when surveying their repertoire of contentious action.

REFERENCES:

- Atton, C. (2002) *Alternative Media*, London: Sage.
- Baringhorst, S. (2008) 'Political Protest on the Net', *German Policy Studies* 4(4): 63-93.
- Cammaerts, B. (2007) 'Media and Communication Strategies of Glocalised Activists: Beyond media-centric thinking', pp. 265-88 in B. Cammaerts and N. Carpentier (Eds.) *Reclaiming the Media: Communication rights and expanding democratic media roles*, Bristol: Intellect.
- Cammaerts, B., Carpentier, N. (2009) 'Blogging the 2003 Iraq War: Challenging the Ideological Model of War and Mainstream Journalism?', *Observatorio* 3(2): <http://www.obs.obercom.pt/>
- Cottle, S. (2008) 'Reporting demonstrations: the changing media politics of

- dissent', *Media, Culture and Society* 30(6): 853-72.
- Cottle, S. (ed.) (2000) *Ethnic Minorities and the Media*, Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Couldry, N. (2004) 'Theorising media as practice'. *Social Semiotics* 14(2): 115-32.
- della Porta, D. and Tarrow, S. (Eds.) (2005) *Transnational Protest and Global Activism*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Downing, J. D. (2008) 'Social Movement Theories and Alternative Media: An Evaluation and Critique', *Communication, Culture and Critique* 1(1): 40-50.
- Downing, J. D., Ford, T. V., Gil, G. and Stein, L. (2001) *Radical Media: Rebelious Communication and Social Movements*, London: Sage.
- Eldridge, J. (1995) *Glasgow Media Group Reader, Volume One: News content, language and visuals*. London: Routledge.
- Ferree, M. M., Gamson, W. A., Gerhards, J. and Rucht, D. (2002) *Shaping Abortion Discourse: Democracy and the Public Sphere in Germany and the United States*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Gamson, W. A. and Wolfsfeld, G. (1993) Movements and Media as Interacting Systems. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 528: 114-27.
- Gitlin, T. (1980) *The Whole World is Watching: Mass media in the making & Unmaking of the New Left*, Berkeley/London: University of California Press.
- Goodwin, J. and Jasper, J. M. (2003) 'Introduction to part III', pp. 49-54 in J. Goodwin and J. M. Jasper (Eds.) *The social movements reader: cases and concepts*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Halloran, J. D., Elliott, P. and Murdock, G. (1970) *Demonstrations and Communication: A Case Study*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Haythornthwaite, C. (2005) Social Networks and Internet Connectivity Effects. *Information, Communication & Society* 8(2): 125-47.
- Herman, E. and Chomsky, N. (1988) *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. New York: Pantheon.
- Hermanns, Heike (2008) 'Mobile Democracy: Mobile Phones as Democratic Tools'. *Politics* 28(2): 74-82.
- Hill, K. A. and Hughes, J. E. (1998) *Cyberpolitics: Citizen Activism in the Age of the Internet*, Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Jasper, J. M. and Goodwin, J. (1999) 'Trouble in Paradigms', *Sociological Forum* 14(1): 107-25.
- Jordan, T. and Taylor, P. A. (2004) *Hacktivism and Cyberwars: Rebels with a cause?*. London: Routledge.

- Kavada, A (2010) 'Image, Bonding, and Collective Identity Across Multiple Platforms: Avaaz on Facebook, MySpace, and YouTube'. Paper presented at the International Communication Association Conference, Singapore, 22/06.
- Keck, M. E. and Sikkink, K. (1998) *Activists Beyond Borders: Advocacy Networks in International Politics*. Ithaca: Cornell University.
- Koopmans, R. (2004) 'Political Opportunity Structure: Some Splitting to Balance the Lumping', pp. 61-74 in J. Goodwin and J. J. Jasper (Eds.) *Rethinking Social Movements: Structure, Meaning and Emotions*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Koopmans, R. and Statham, P. (1999) 'Political Claims Analysis: integrating protest event and political discourse approaches'. *Mobilization: An International Journal* 4(2): 203-22.
- Krotz, F. (2008) 'Media Connectivity: Concepts, Conditions, and Consequences', pp. 13-31 in A. Hepp, F. Krotz & S. Moores (Eds.), *Network, Connectivity and Flow: Key concepts for Media and Cultural Studies*. New York: Hampton Press.
- Liebes, T. and Katz, E. (1990) *The Export of Meaning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lipschutz, Ronnie D. (2005) 'Networks of Knowledge and Practice: Global Civil Society and Global Communications', pp. 59-80 in W. de Jong, M. Shaw and N. Stammers (Eds.) *Global Activism, Global Media*. London/New York: Pluto Press.
- Livingstone, S. (2007) 'On the material and the symbolic: Silverstone's double articulation of research traditions in new media studies'. *New Media and Society* 9(1): 16-24.
- Martin-Barbero, J. (1993) *Communication, Culture and Hegemony: From the Media to Mediation*. London: Sage.
- Mathiesen, T. (1997) 'The Viewer Society: Michel Foucault's "Panopticon" Revisited', *Theoretical Criminology* 1(2): 215-34.
- McAdam, D. (2005) 'Movement Strategy and Dramaturgical Framing in Democratic States: The Case of the Civil Rights Movement', pp. 117-35 in S. Chambers and A. Costain (Eds.) *Deliberation, Democracy and the Media*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- McCammon, H. J., Sanders Muse, C., Newman, H. D. and Terrell, T. M. (2007) 'Movement Framing and Discursive Opportunity Structures: The Political Successes of the U.S. Women's Jury Movements', *American Sociological Review* 72(5): 725-49.
- McChesney, R. W. (2008) *The Political Economy of Media: Enduring Issues, Emerging Dilemmas*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- McCurdy, P. (2010) 'Breaking the spiral of silence: unpacking the "media

- debate" within global justice movements. A case study of Dissent and the 2005 Gleneagles G8 summit'. *Interface: a journal for and about social movements* 2(2): 42-67.
- Melucci, A. (1996) *Challenging Codes: Collective Action in the Information Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Meyer, D. S. and Minkoff, D. (2004) 'Conceptualizing Political Opportunity', *Social Forces* 82(4): 1457-92.
- Meyer, D. S. and Whittier, N. (1994) 'Social Movement Spillover', *Social Problems* 41: 277-298.
- Morozov, E. (2009) 'The brave new world of slacktivism', *Foreign Policy*, 19/05. See: http://neteffect.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2009/05/19/the_brave_new_world_of_slacktivism (last accessed 25/05/2011).
- Norris, P. (2001) *Digital Divide? Civic engagement, information poverty and the Internet in democratic societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, also available at: <http://www.pippanorris.com/>
- Oliver, P. E. and Maney, G. M. (2000) 'Political Processes and Local Newspaper Coverage of Protest Events: From Selection Bias to Triadic Interactions', *American Journal of Sociology* 106(2): 463-505.
- Polletta, F. (2004) 'Culture is Not Just in Your Head', pp. 97-110 in J. Goodwin and J. J. Jasper (Eds.) *Rethinking Social Movements: Structure, Meaning and Emotions*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Silverstone, R. (2002) 'Complicity and collusion in the mediation of everyday life'. *New Literary History* 33(4): 761-80.
- Snow, D. A., and Benford, R. D. (1988) 'Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization'. *International Social Movement Research* 1: 197-217.
- Söderberg, J. (2007) *Hacking Capitalism: The Free and Open Source Software Movement*. London: Routledge.
- Tarrow, S. (1994) *Power in Movement: Social Movements and Contentious Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tarrow, S. (2005) *The New Transnational Activism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thompson, J. B. (1995) *The Media and Modernity: a Social Theory of the Media*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Thumim, N. (2009) 'Everyone has a story to tell': Mediation and self-representation in two UK institutions, *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 12(6): 617-38.
- van de Donk, W., Loader, B. D., Nixon, P. G. and Rucht, D. (Eds.) (2004) *Cyberprotest: New media, citizens and social movements*. London: Routledge.
- Williams, R. (1997) 'The social shaping of information and communica-

tions technologies', pp. 299-338 in H. Kubicek, W. H. Dutton, and R. Williams (Eds.) *The Social Shaping of Information Superhighways: European and American roads to the information society*. Frankfurt/New York: Campus Verlag and St. Martin's Press.