

**newsletter
WG2**

A WORD OF WELCOME

INTERVIEWS WITH WG2 MEMBERS

REPORTS ON WG2 SPECIAL ISSUES

REPORTS ON WG2 BOOKS

chair

Nico Carpentier [nico.carpentier@vub.ac.be]

vice-chairs

Manuel Damásio [mjdamasio@ulusofona.pt]

Miroljub Radojkovic [miroljub.radojkovic@fpn.bg.ac.rs]

liaison officers

Bozena Mierzejewska [bozena.mierzejewska@unisg.ch]

Igor Vobič [igor.vobic@fdv.uni-lj.si]

Jose Manuel Noguera Vivo [jmnoguera@gmail.com]

Melanie Bourdaa [melaniebourdaa@yahoo.fr]

Lucia Vesnic-Alujevic [lucy.vessal@gmail.com]

Ana Milojevic [ana.milojevic@fpn.bg.ac.rs]



A WORD OF WELCOME

Dear News Letter Reader,

This News Letter is the last publication of Working Group 2 (WG2) of the Cost Action "Transforming Audiences, Transforming Societies" (TATS). WG2 met for the very last time on 7 February 2014, during the Open Conference of the TATS COST Action at the University of Ljubljana, in Slovenia.

This meeting was a moment to look back at our achievements, and the impressive list of projects that were realised by the members of WG2. With its focus on the theme of "Audience interactivity and participation", during its four year existence, WG2 was a key location for reflections about participation and interaction, which were translated into a considerable number of publications. This News Letter contains an overview of all these publications, and thus celebrates the intellectual work of all the members of WG2. As the TATS Cost Action website will remain online for an indeterminate period, the WG2 output page (at <http://www.cost-transforming-audiences.eu/node/303>) remains, together with this News Letter, a good starting point to access the work of all WG2 members.

It is difficult to capture the diversity of the achievements of WG2 in a few words, but let me still offer you some thoughts about what we did. One of the important elements of the work of WG2 was to scrutinise the relationship between participation and interaction, from a variety of angles. These concepts of interaction/participation

became also more firmly connected to a series of other fields: journalism, politics, management and history, and to concepts such as affect, genre and social capital, ... Finally, also the further enrichment of participatory theory can be seen as a significant outcome of WG2's work. By focussing on participation (and interaction) the working group could not only show how important this concept (and the processes it labels) are in contemporary societies, but also how diverse the actual materialisations of participation are, and the importance of the contexts in which these materialisations are embedded. In doing so, WG2 moved away from the simplifying dichotomy of utopianism/dystopianism to enter the complexity that the diversity of participatory practices incorporates. At the same time, WG2 could not resist broadening its scope, in order to reflect on the societal role of academia and its semi-autonomous position, a very necessary exercise we only rarely expose ourselves to.

The 7 February meeting was also a moment to say thank you to all WG2 officers. First of all, there were the two WG2 vice-chairs: Manuel José Damásio and Miroljub Radojkovic. Secondly, there are the nine WG2 Task Force Leaders: Peter Dahlgren (who ran - together with me - Task Force 1: Interrogating audiences: theoretical horizons of participation). Birgit Stark and Peter Lunt took charge of Task Force 2: Public voice and mediated participation. WG2's vice-chair, Manuel José Damásio, also led Task Force 3: Networked belonging and networks of belonging, together with Paula Cordeiro. José Manuel Noguera, Mélanie Bourdaa and Francesca Pasquali were the leaders of Task

Force 4: Cross-media production and audience involvement. Thirdly, WG2 had seven Liaison Officers (LOs) (some of which were also Task Force Leaders): Bozena Mierzejewska and Birgit Stark, LOs for industry (including PBS); Mélanie Bourdaa, LO for civil society (including audience NGOs and alternative media); José Manuel Noguera Vivo, LO for other academic (EU) projects & networks; Lucia Vesnic-Alujevic, LO for politics; Ana Milojević, LO for journalists, and Igor Vobič, LO for young scholars. Finally, I also want to thank the Action's Steering Group, with Geoffroy Patriarche (Action chair), Helena Bilandzic (Action vice-chair), Kim Schröder (WG1 chair), Frauke Zeller (WG3 chair) and Cristina Ponte (WG4 chair), for a collaboration which was efficient, respectful and pleasant.

But we should also - albeit briefly - look at the future. The TATS Action originated from the ECREA Audience and Reception Studies Section, and together with the IAMCR Audience Section, and the many other ECREA, IAMCR and ICA sections, divisions, working groups and special interest groups, this Section offers an excellent platform for the continuation of our work. Also the many cross-working group initiatives, within the TATS Cost Action, will provide us with new opportunities to continue studying our ever changing media/social realities.

I hope to meet you on another occasion, wherever and whenever that may be, and I wish you a pleasurable reading of this News Letter,

Nico Carpentier

Chair of Working Group 2 "Audience interactivity and participation"
Cost Action "Transforming Audiences, Transforming Societies"
<http://www.cost-transforming-audiences.eu/>

INTERVIEWS WITH WG2 MEMBERS

Interview with WG2 vice-chair

Manuel José Damásio

Institution

Universidade Lusófona de Humanidades e Tecnologias

Country

Portugal

Interviewer

Urška Berdnik (graduate student)

Institution

University of Ljubljana

Country

Slovenia

UB: You are one of the Vice-Chairs of the WG2 of the European Cost Action IS0906. Taking in account that you have been helping leading the group for four years, what were the mayor contributions and achievements of COST Action IS0906 over the years?

MJD: The first and probably the core achievement of the Action was the networking. This was an excellent opportunity for people to get to know one another, and at the same time COST Action also gave us the option to clearly understand what kind of interests exist in media research worldwide, because media research is a very broad area and people tend to focus on very specific areas of intervention. The second most important achievement would definitely be the improvement in research methods in the media field. Namely, the action focused on how we can improve the research and how

we can use different methods for different goals. To sum up, it was an opportunity for the communication experts to see, share and understand different methods that are used on the international scale.

UB: As the head of the film, video and multimedia department at Universidade Lusófona de Humanidades e Tecnologias, which part of the COST action interested you the most?

MJD: I come from a film school and we are completely different from the majority of the schools involved in the Action. Most of the people participating in the Action have a social sciences background, but we have a more artistic background and we have a much applied research perspective and a lot of empirical research. So for me it was a great opportunity to meet people who come with a social sciences background. We were therefore bridging the gap in different types of trainings, which I think is huge. For example it was very interesting to try to understand what type of training and research is done in schools more oriented towards social sciences. On the other hand those from a social sciences background were able to get an insight of what is happening in other fields of training, more practical ones that is. I think this Action was a good opportunity for the field of training to reinforce itself, to gain identity and also to connect itself with the other fields of activity where the media also have a role.

UB: Was there anything that you did not expect during the COST action?

MJD: The thing that struck me the most was

the high level of organisation from the first moment I enrolled in the Action. The second thing that shocked me the most was the level of the professionalism of the scholars participating in the Action, which was proved by the materials that have been produced during the Action, such as publications, videos etc.

Interview with WG2 vice-chair

Miroљjub Radojkovic

Institution

University of Belgrade

Country

Serbia

Interviewer

Vanja ŹiŹić (graduate student)

Institution

University of Ljubljana

Country

Slovenia

VŹ: The working groups in Action were thematically defined clusters of scholars that carry out and coordinate the actual scientific work within the COST Action. How did you contribute to this Action as a vice chairman of the WG 2?

MR: I offered our faculty magazine as one of the means for publicity. In the beginning it was just for the WG2 group but later other groups became interested in it as well, so we made a book out of it. But the biggest job that I had to go through was working around bureaucracy and administration, trying to get young scholars into the COST project. Our group [from Serbia] is one of the largest and

also a group with mostly younger scholars, who were able to use what COST offered. They could publish special issues, collected points and so on. I think this was my greatest contribution and personal satisfaction.

VŹ: Your work can be seen in various publications. Can you explain what were your scholarly interests within the topic of Audience interactivity and participation?

MR: My interest was to pass awareness that we are dealing with a new public called cross audience. When people say they are watching something, they could be using television or telephone or a tablet. The other mistaken perception that I tried to explain is that a generation gap doesn't exist. It is true that young people are computer literal but older people have more time and are getting more involved. And the third thing that interests me is the question of education, but I didn't manage to write about it as much, because one of my tasks was more about reading other people's work.

VŹ: This Action is supposed to offer a different perspective on audience research. In what way is this Action different from conventional perspectives on audience research?

MR: We are trying to leave the old models that assume a strong communicator and a helpless audience. A fairly new idea, explained in the COST Action, was also a ethnographic research and several others you can find in our outputs.

VŹ: How is the future looking for COST Action?

MR: Everything that was done here is nice, because it was supported and financed. I think COST will remain alive, but we need someone to roll up their sleeves and starts lobbying. During this Action I never heard anybody to volunteer for that. The problem is that EU allocates more money to natural sciences. So if there are any tendencies for developing new projects, people should address them publicly. People who were working in this Action should have done that, so more Universities could gather and propose new projects.

Interview with WG2 external liaison officer for other academic projects & networks

José Manuel Noguera Vivo

Institution

Catholic University of Murcia

Country

Spain

Interviewer

Urška Berdnik (graduate student)

Institution

University of Ljubljana

Country

Slovenia

UB: You were one of the WG 2 external liaison officers. What kind of tasks were you facing during the COST action?

JMNv: In the beginning of the COST Action my assignment was to find potential candidates who were interested in the field of audiences to form part of the Action or to participate in any way possible. Later on

I was coordinating publications and work groups. My work was basically to gather the most information possible from investigators around Europe.

UB: Which part of the COST action was for you as a specialist in cyber media, social media and participatory journalism the biggest challenge?

JMNv: I realized that investigators of different fields are facing the same questions despite its individual point of view and particular context of research. We have the same doubts, the same methodological problems and often we just do not know which approach use when investigating these relatively new phenomena. Due to this intensive cooperation we were able to exchange and to share our knowledge.

UB: What was the thing that surprised you the most during the COST action?

JMNv: In the end of the Action we discovered that the most important results of the action were in making contacts. Namely, these are the ones that allow us to become better investigators in a somewhat united European kind of way and combining their own particular research. This was also the motive for creating some workshops, publications, special issues or meetings for the scholars.

UB: How would you like for COST action to develop in the future?

JMNv: I would say that the end of this Action means also the beginning of many new projects which are already happening at this very moment. The COST Action

aims real changes in the field, especially proposes new initiatives for stakeholders and new connections for policy makers. The networks that have been created during the last few years will allow experts to confront themselves with actual objects connected with participation, participatory journalism and participatory politics. And last but not least, it will also empower them to work more profoundly in their research field.

Interview with WG2 external liaison officer for politics

Lucia Vesnic-Alujevic

Institution

Joint Research Centre, Institute for the Protection and Security of Citizens

Country

Italy

Interviewer

Urška Berdnik (graduate student)

Institution

University of Ljubljana

Country

Slovenia

VŽ: COST Action IS0906 has become a network stimulated by a group of people who are actively involved in the Action's work. You joined the project in 2012 as a liaison officer (LO) for politics. What was your assignment?

LV-A: When I joined the Action in 2012 I worked on gathering interviews and essays with politicians and policy makers. That was also my biggest task as LO for politics. I also

collaborated on several newsletters that we produced in the WG2 from 2012 onwards.

VŽ: What were the biggest challenges that you encountered as LO for politics of the working group 2?

LV-A: The biggest challenge was finding politicians who would be interested in writing an essay or who would have enough time to do the interview with an academic, because politicians are still not very interested in the academic work and they don't really think our work is important. In my opinion, the main goal of the majority of them is to reach the average citizen. All together we had four essays, which were enough for the assignment, but I think it would be better if we could get more cooperation and make a selection.

VŽ: You are also participating in other projects, such as the Cross-WG interest group project called Twitter and the Public Sphere. Can you tell me what are these projects about and how are you planning to continue the work you started at COST?

LV-A: Twitter and Public Sphere is a new project. It's about the use of Twitter in Europe during the campaign for the European parliament elections this year. The topic is interesting to me because my PhD project was also about the use of social media in European parliament elections. But besides my personal interests, I think these topics are very important in general and can be very successful since many scholars across different countries showed interest in them.

There are also several other project that are developing now, by the end of COST - such as CEDAR - the new Consortium on Emerging Directions in Audience Research for young researchers. We are trying to stay together through these new projects, but we still need to find ways to get financed, otherwise the projects will not survive.

VŽ: Who will in your opinion mostly benefit from this Action?

LV-A: It was great for all the researchers in the field of audience studies who got involved in the project. It is also important because it opened up new projects, as I mentioned before. We will try to stay together and continue our collaboration and I hope that the future is looking bright for us.

Interview with WG2 external liaison officer for journalists

Ana Milojević

Institution

University of Belgrade

Country

Serbia

Interviewer

Zarja Protner (graduate student)

Institution

University of Ljubljana

Country

Slovenia

ZP: What were the specifics of your work as the liaison officer for journalists within the WG 2 of the COST Action?

AM: The key task was to prepare a collection of essays or interview essays with the stakeholders, my part were journalists. So we did the interviews with journalists that are published together with interviews with the politicians in a special journal. I think this is a good thing, because COST is a rather closed network of academics, so the point was to get our work also out of this circle.

ZP: What is the crucial shift in the relationship between journalists and the audiences?

AM: There are a lot of concepts that consider the changing relationship between journalists and audiences. I think the key now is to think of it in terms of participatory journalism. This means that journalists are not the only ones having the authority to talk, but they have to produce the content together with the audience. So this is what the WG2 did, the participatory dimension in the democratic terms, journalists and audience participation, and other stakeholders participating with audience to create content together - whether it is journalism, marketing, advertising, making political decisions ...

ZP: What insights on the changing journalistic styles and roles has the Action brought?

AM: It is very hard to measure all the dynamics between journalists and audiences, for many reasons. The changes are happening, but there are some subgroups in journalistic community. Some of them are opposing the changes and trying to keep their traditional

roles and way of doing things. On the other hand, there are more and more online journalists, who have the hardest job in my opinion and are in the most unrewarding position. There are many dimensions that you have to take into account when talking about the transformations in the media and participatory journalism.

ZP: For you personally, what was the most rewarding about the COST Action experience?

AM: I come from Serbia and for many years we were somehow at the back door of the academic world, so we did not have a lot of opportunities to network and talk to the people that we read, to get to know them. So this was really good for our community in Serbia, which was very closed and not able to participate more within the European and broader academic networks. There are also a lot of co-authored journal articles coming out of it, even some chapters in the COST Action books. That could not have been done without participating in the COST Action. So it has really helped us to get into the picture of academics in Europe and to position our work within it. We have established the interpersonal connections and a lot of the collaboration will probably continue after the Action.

Interview with WG2 external liaison officer for young scholars

Igor Vobič

Institution

University of Ljubljana

Country

Slovenia

Interviewer

Urška Berdnik (graduate student)

Institution

University of Ljubljana

Country

Slovenia

UB: As a journalism researcher what kind of knowledge did you obtain during the conference that will be helpful also in your future academic research? Is there anything that you would add to COST Action?

IV: I gained the knowledge from distinctive fields that have to do with media research because we combined a variety of the research fields that are associated with audience research. I have gained many fresh theoretical and methodological tools to use in my research activities. I must also mention the part of the acquaintances, namely I and other young scholars had the opportunity to meet and work with a number of distinguished scholars, which was definitely enriching and I hope we will be investigating together more in the future. The only thing I would change or add is an extra year or more to the action.

UB: What are the main differences that distinguish COST from other similar projects?

IV: This project is centred in sharing our knowledge so we can reinforce certain areas of research or to strengthen some related researching areas. Therefore our meetings were quite often and they were also very well organised, also as far as finances, travels, accommodation are concerned. Of course there are other similar projects like COST Action, but none in this extent and with this level of professionalism on all levels. I really hope to be a part of another similar COST Action in the future.

UB: You were one of this year's organisers of the final COST Action. How would you describe the experience?

IV: I think it was a great idea to leave the organisation in the hands of younger members of the Action. I hope we proved that we deserved the trust. This way I acquired a lot of new skills and it was a great personal experience as well as an opportunity for presenting the work of our Social Communication Research Centre at the Faculty of Social Sciences.

UB: How do you imagine the future of COST Action?

IV: The cooperation is undoubtedly going to continue in different projects and collaborations. Namely, COST Action definitely enabled consolidation of bonds created between the scholars that already knew each other before and at the same time allowed us to make new bonds. Personally, I must say that we were bonding mostly on the regional level with the communication experts from the Western part of the Balkans. Besides future

international collaborations I also expect some co-authorships.

Interview with WG2 task force leader 1 - Interrogating audiences: theoretical horizons of participation

Peter Dahlgren

Institution

Lund University

Country

Sweden

Interviewer

Zarja Protner (graduate student)

Institution

University of Ljubljana

Country

Slovenia

ZP: As the leader of the first task force, which focused on theoretical horizons of participation, what were the insights and developments that the action has brought to the concept?

PD: One of the important developments has been to sharpen the concept of participation because it is a term that derives from several different discourses in social sciences, and it easily becomes rather blend and innocuous. Nico (Carpentier, co.a.) has been leading the way to underscore the importance of connecting the idea of participation to power relations. So it is something more than just interaction, just being co-present, more than just having access to media. There is a kind of interface with theories of democracy and citizenship.

I think that has been a very fruitful development, I have benefited a lot from these discussions.

ZP: What perspectives on the opportunities for democratic participation in online media were outlined in the Action? Are they optimistic or rather sceptic, as you imply with the concept of online media as a »solo sphere« of isolated and individualised communication?

PD: This is a very central question. We position ourselves into debates that have been going on since the mid 90's about the digital media, democracy and the public sphere. We have been underscoring the notion of the context, the idea of contingencies and the impact on how, where and why people use media for what purposes. We are actively resisting what we might call discourses of technological determinism or the quick techno fix for democracy that still can be found circulating in policy circles. So the solution to the problem, which ultimately has to do with participation and power relations, is presented as one of technology - throw some computers at the problem and that will solve it. We have been strongly arguing and presenting evidence against that. Where we end up is a position where we say yes, media can be used for progressive civic purposes to enhance aspects of democracy, to promote participation, and at the same time, we have to be aware of how the context shapes the usage and this includes the architecture of digital media, the political economy, the power relations around it. The struggle to navigate the media landscape in ways that are fruitful for democracy continues, there

are no simple solutions. What we try to do is to find this emotional and intellectual balance between optimism and pessimism.

ZP: What was the most challenging in working within the task force of the Action?

PD: The wonderful thing that an Action like this provides are the possibilities to network and to cooperate, we are all brought together, and yet as we know everybody in academia is really »under the gun«, everybody is overworked, usually underpaid, and the situation is getting tougher on many fronts, so I think it is the practical thing of trying to balance responsibilities at home with engagements in the Action. But I think people have done a terrific job, under a lot of pressure they have still been able to produce all these publications together, so I am really impressed by the engagement and the results that we have achieved.

.....
Interview with WG2 task force leader 2 -
Public voice and mediated participation

Peter Lunt
Institution
University of Leicester
Country
United Kingdom

Interviewer
Vanja Žižić (graduate student)
Institution
University of Ljubljana
Country
Slovenia

VŽ: Your role in this project was being one of the task force leaders of the WG2. How did you get involved in this project?

PL: I was a part of the discussions about this Action from the beginning, even before we decided what task forces were going to be. It was an emerging process, which was based on the interests of the researchers that were within the groups and I sort of volunteered to be the task force leader for one of the emerging groups that came out.

VŽ: What were in your opinion the main achievements of your group?

PL: There were two main achievements. One was that this Action enabled a group of emerging scholars to become connected and to develop their work in the context of the Action and it has been a fantastic experience for them and for the field. It enabled a very good networking and has put people from all over Europe in contact. The other main achievement of our group was that we were very focused on producing the particular outputs. But this very focus on outputs has put us in a situation where we haven't really developed collectively our reflections. So I think the biggest challenge was creating the balance between getting special issues out and developing reflections on theories of media and participation.

VŽ: With the advent of the new Internet-related media, the notions of access, interaction, interactivity and participation have again entered academic debates. Some reflections pointed their potentially beneficial

increase in democratic communication and the strengthening of social capital and civil society. Would you agree with these statements?

PL: Yes, I do, but I would not put myself in the camp who thinks this is absolutely optimistic and transformative. We have to look very carefully and that is the next phase of the research and it is something that came out of our work in this Action as well. We have to move away from the oscillation between optimism and pessimism and this is a really big task now - which is to focus on the actual cases, to look in detail, which media is used where, by whom, how they use it. It is kind of like going back to the old questions about mass communication, who communicates to who on what channel, just that now we have to deal with different media context.

VŽ: How can the momentum developed within the COST continue after the Action?

PL: As Sonia Livingstone said in her keynotes - when we started this project there was a lot of discussion about the end of audiences, but it doesn't look like that right now, and I think COST Action has helped to that thinking. And inevitably some of that thinking will continue.



Interview with WG2 task force leader 4
- Cross-media production and audience involvement

Francesca Pasquali

Institution

Università Degli Studi di Bergamo

Country

Italy

Interviewer

Zarja Protner (graduate student)

Institution

University of Ljubljana

Country

Slovenia

ZP: In your perspective, what were some of the accomplishments of your working group?

FP: I was one of the leaders of the task force on cross media production and audience involvement. From the theoretical point of view, the most important achievement was to bring some insights from participatory theory and civic culture theory within the field of cross media production and audience involvement. We started to look at it more from a pure media studies perspective. So it was very interesting to have this task force within the working group that was concerned with participation and civic engagement. The perspective that was brought in was the one of power relations, also within more leisure oriented media consumption activities or more interaction oriented consumption activities, where there are also great opportunities and risks. At another level, what was special about this COST Action was that it was a very productive Action, we had the opportunity to publish a lot, to

work within the group and also across the different working groups and task forces in order to write together and exchange ideas.

ZP: What are in your opinion some of the most socially relevant topics of research on digital audiences and participation that were outlined in the Action?

FP: There is an emphasis on media industries that are enhancing participation and the risks along with opportunities around it. What came up in the Action and is something important to be thinking is the responsibility of people participating. I think this is a crucial point and a step forward for the debate, because right now, audiences really are active and have no more excuses, so they have to take responsibilities for what they do. But focusing on the power relations, people are experiencing positions of the subject and the object within the participatory relation. Translating these ideas into media studies can be very interesting.

ZP: Which of the activities within the Action were the most rewarding for you from the personal and academic perspective?

FP: Practically all of them, I am very happy with the action. We had a lot of opportunities to meet and to work together. The opportunity to have co-writing meeting before and after the official meeting was a very good idea, because we had the chance to discuss and work in a smaller group, writing together. I am also very happy with the publishing activity of the group, we have done a lot of work and it was very rich in variety and in quality. This was not my

first COST Action, so I know how it works, but this one was designed to encourage our participation and productivity.

ZP: Do you think some of the work will continue also after the end of the Action?

FP: I am quite confident it will. We have already discussed to organize some trans-working groups panels at other conferences. The idea is to continue working together on already established topics. We have already planned to meet again and to try to publish together again.

Interview with WG2 chair

Nico Carpentier

Institution

Vrije Universiteit of Brussel (VUB) and Charles University

Countries

Belgium and Czech Republic

Interviewer

Zarja Protner (graduate student)

Institution

University of Ljubljana

Country

Slovenia

ZP: From your perspective as the working group chair, what are the main achievements of the working group 2 within the COST Action?

NC: I think the first achievement was to get all the people together. Everybody is referring to participation and concerned about it, but there has not been a group that has been

really interested in working on the concept in depth, so that was one achievement. What we have tried to do, and that was our second achievement, is to create a theoretical and historical foundation. Because in quite a lot of literature the notion of participation is used, but it is never theorized, it is never fully developed. There is hardly any reflection about the notion itself. The third thing was to have a group focusing on interaction. That has always been disconnected from the people that were interested in participation. What we tried to do is to connect these different approaches. From the very beginning, we tried to be as inclusive as possible and also bring in those traditions that are almost never talked about, like participation and power. And we managed to get some ideas in confrontation with each other, so it was important to bring these different people with different ways of thinking together.

ZP: What were the biggest challenges that you encountered as the chair during the four years of the Action?

NC: Management, management and management. It is a really big group. I think the COST Action has to be output driven, it should be more than having a pleasant time together (without underestimating pleasure), there should be something coming out of it. And creating an environment in which people could be productive was a very serious challenge with the group that big. That was the biggest challenge, but at the same time, once people started to work in that environment, it went wonderfully well.

ZP: You edited many of the COST

publications and special journal issues. In your opinion, what is the importance of these outputs of the Action?

NC: The diversity of approaches. It is not about having that one set of articles, but the broad diversity of all these different approaches, all targeted on participation and interaction. On one hand, we went really in depth looking at participation and interaction and on the other hand we have looked at the wide field of relationships between participation and interaction and these other fields like journalism, media management, the political, citizenship, and all of these fields were becoming connected.

ZP: The Action is now coming to an end. How can the momentum that was developed continue afterwards?

NC: I think we should be modest. Academic life goes on and we should also acknowledge that projects like this come and go. We should not expect that all of a sudden the entire academic reflection on audiences will change. I do think the network in itself will produce new ones that are grounded in this huge network. Thinking about the audiences in all its diversities, bringing them together and producing coherent reflections on them, that matters. But there is also this idea that it will be continued and passed on to other networks. So there are two legacies - the work we did, making it available, putting it on paper, that is one, and the creation of new structures, new networks that will be coming out of this, that is the second legacy. Which is more than we could hope for.

REPORTS ON WG2 SPECIAL ISSUES

Below you can find reports on the special issues produced by WG2 between 2011 and 2014. An overview of these publications is also available in the video made by Manuel José Damásio: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iGS69ugr214&feature=youtu.be>



“Interrogating audiences: theoretical horizons of participation” in CM: *Communication Management Quarterly*, 2011, vol. 6, nr. 1.

Available at: <http://www.cost.eu/media/publications/12-02-Interrogating-audiences-Theoretical-horizons-of-participation-in-CM-Communication-Management-Quarterly>

Report by Ana Milojević

The special issue “Interrogating audiences: theoretical horizons of participation”, edited by Nico Carpentier and Peter Dahlgren, in the journal *CM Communication Management Quarterly*, 2011, no. 21,

was the first publication of the COST Action IS0906 “Transforming Audiences, Transforming Societies”. The first special issue of the Action tries to contribute to the development of participatory theory within the framework of communication and media studies. The main aim of the issue was to reconcile conceptual contingency with the concept of participation which is signifying anything and everything. In order to deepen the theorisations of participation, two strategies were used.

In a first cluster of articles, the concept of participation was confronted with another theoretical concept or tradition highlighting the theoretical development of participation. In the second cluster of articles, the workings of the notion of participation were analysed within a specific topical field, aiming at deepening participatory theory by confronting participation with the contextualised logics of that topical field. The first article “The concept of participation. If they have access and interact, do they really participate?”, by Nico Carpentier, is an introductory text that focuses on the concept of participation. It grounds participation in democratic theory, but then broadens the scope towards the political. This movement allowed the author to list the key characteristics of participation and to provide the delineation of participation from access and interaction. In the first cluster of articles that follow, in which participation encounters other theoretical concepts or traditions, Manuel José Damásio links the concept to social capital theory in the article titled “Social capital: Between interaction and participation.” He discusses the dimensions of social capital, and then

moves into participation, first at a general level, and then more focused on the media sphere. Marie Dufrasne and Geoffroy Patriarche's article "Applying genre theory to citizen participation in public policy making: Theoretical perspectives on participatory genres" combines participation with the genre concept, using the horizon of public policy making. They use a series of topical questions to theorise participatory genres, taking context and interrelationships into account. Peter Dahlgren concludes the first part of this special issue, by confronting participation with the online environment in the article "Parameters of online participation: Conceptualising civic contingencies". The author distinguishes five parameters for participation: trajectories, modalities, motivations, sociality and visibility, and then discusses the contingencies that both facilitate and hinder participation.

The second cluster of articles looks at the workings of participation in specific topical fields. Nóra Nyiró, Tamás Csordás and Dóra Horváth, in the article "Competing by participation - A winning marketing tool", discuss how participation functions within the field of marketing, combining both activity-focused and output-focused forms of participation. Nurçay Türkoğlu's article "Mediated public voices need theory to be heard" addresses the field of critical media literacy, arguing for the application of participation's theoretical frameworks on the world of the everyday, and at the same time analysing the thresholds that impede such developments. Pille Vengerfeldt and Pille Runnel look at the field of museum studies, and the changing nature of the

museum which has increasingly highlighted the role (and participation) of the visitor. In the article "When the museum becomes the message for participating audiences", through a series of topical questions, combined with three key institutional roles of the museum (economic, cultural and public), the authors describe the reasons for and meanings of museum participation. Miroljub Radojkovic and Ana Milojevic in the article "A critical analysis of two audience prototypes and their participatory dimensions" return to the audience, describing the participatory dimensions of two historical audience prototypes, and showing how these two prototypes co-exist and overlap. Finally, in the last article of the second part, Francesca Pasquali analyses participation in the publishing industry, which has been structurally affected by digitalisation processes. This article titled "The participatory turn in the publishing industry: Rhetorics and practices" suggests a recognition of the diversity of the forms of participation.

.....

"Public voice and mediated participation" in *COMMUNICATIONS: The European Journal of Communication Research*, 2012, vol. 37, nr. 3.

Available at: <http://www.degruyter.com/view/j/commun.2012.37.issue-3/issue-files/commun.2012.37.issue-3.xml>

Report by Lucia Vesnic-Alujevic

This issue was edited by Birgit Stark and Peter Lunt, coordinators of the Working Group 2, Task Force 2 "Public voice and mediated participation" that focuses on the political dimension of WG2 research agenda. It consists of four papers whose focus was institutionalized politics and the public sphere.

The changes in media environment have been seen as both beneficial for some and not beneficial for the functioning of democracy for other scholars in the field of media studies. While certain think that it leads to the fragmentation of the public sphere and diminished potential for reaching the consensus, others believe in the enhanced public sphere through the online engagement that could lead to the ideal of deliberative democracy and participation.

This issue deals with these opportunities and challenges while looking at the participation from both citizens' perspective as well as through news production process. The first theme focuses on the relationship between the internet use and political engagement offline and discusses if the audiences feel more connected through new media. The second is directed towards the participation in news production in a broader context and what the consequences for journalism might be because of the changed relationship between journalists and citizens. The authors of the articles are from different disciplines and several countries, with broader understanding of concepts of public participation and engagement and their interaction with politics and civic cultures.

One is identifying patterns of interaction

between online and traditional political communication and participation. The other explores democratic values as anchors in the life world. Another paper is examining how alternative media interact with audiences and how audiences become producers of the content. And the last one considers the necessary skills and their impact on the use of online news media and interactive news features among higher education students.

Consequently, the understanding of conditions and possibilities for public engagement in and through new media and their implications for the character of public discourse and participation are important issues to be discussed in the audience studies.

.....

"Audience Research and media management" in the *International Journal on Media Management*, 2012, vol. 14, nr. 2.

Available at: url: <http://www.mediajournal.org/ojs/index.php/jmm/issue/view/53>

Report by Birgit Stark

The focus issue on Audience Research and Media Management, edited by Bozena I. Mierzejewska, appeared in the *Journal on Media Management* - Vol 14, No 2 (2012) -, which is a publication of the Institute for Media and Communications Management (University of St. Gallen, Switzerland). The issue deals with one of the most important challenges for media managers today: rapid technological change and its

implications for audience measurement. New media technologies, especially digital environments, demand new approaches for determining audience value and the development of up-to-date performance metrics. This is imminently relevant for both companies relying on advertising revenue as well as for marketers.

The focus issue starts with three articles by renowned scholars who explore concrete cases of new media audience measurement: “Measuring Media Use Across Platforms. Evolving Audience Information Systems” by Harsh Taneja and Utsav Mamoria, “Audience Behavior in the Multi-Screen ‘Video-Verse’” by Patricia F. Phalen and Richard V. Ducey, and “Capturing ‘Human Bandwidth’. A Multidimensional Model for Measuring Attention on Web Sites” by Nan Zheng, Hsiang Iris Chyi, and Kelly Kaufhold. The focus issue then offers three invited essays written by both researchers and practitioners. Philip M. Napoli, professor of communication and media management at the Fordham Schools of Business in New York and director of the Fordham University Donald McGannon Communication Research Center, examines how changes in audience behavior and audience information systems affect academic audience research (“Audience Evolution and the Future of Audience Research”). He focuses on the field of ratings analysis and points to the need of new rating systems that are compatible with new media environments. Second, David Gunzerath, Senior Vice President and Associate Director of the Media Rating Council (MRC), explores “Current Trends in U.S. Media Measurement Methods”. Probably

the most substantial trend he identifies is hybrid measurement: using “multiple data sources in the creation of media use estimates”. He shows how a combination of traditional and state-of-the-art methods will be necessary in order to keep in pace with media change and new forms of audience behavior. Finally, Horst Stipp, Senior Vice President, Strategic Insights and Innovation, NBC Universal, addresses the branding of television networks (“The Branding of Television Networks: Lessons From Branding Strategies in the U.S. Market”). He gives an assessment of how the reported changes affect branding and argues that even business strategies that have proven to be successful for decades must not irrevocably be clung to if market and technology realities are undergoing profound changes.

.....

“Networked belonging and networks of belonging” in Observatorio (OBS*), 2012, vol. 6, nr. 0.

Available at: <http://obs.obercom.pt/index.php/obs/issue/view/34>

Report by Lucia Vesnic-Alujevic

This special issue, published in Observatorio’s Special issue in 2012 focuses on research topics that the Task Force 3 of the Working group 2 was dealing with, namely networked belonging and networks of belonging. It consists of twelve articles that are using different backgrounds and perspectives to explore the notions of the “networked belonging” and “networks of belonging” in

the new media environment. These concepts are discussed, for instance, in the context of social relationships and social media; sharing values and practices, new forms of belonging challenging the existing patterns, new forms of social activism. One group of the articles discuss group integration and emotional need to belong to the group while the others explore the social need to be a part of the group, through studying the context of online social networking experience and community experience.

The social capital and users’ activities are used as the basis of collective actions and social relationships. In that sense, the networked life world is created through sharing values and practices with others. This is facilitated today through online activities which supports networked belonging and new forms of relationships. However, networks of belonging are still rooted in offline interactions and identifications.

.....

“Audience Involvement and New Production Paradigms” in Participations. Journal of audience and reception studies, 2012, volume 9, issue 2.

Available at: <http://www.participations.org/Volume%209/Issue%202/contents.htm>

Report by José-Manuel Noguera Vivo

This issue, edited by José-Manuel Noguera Vivo, Francesca Pasquali and Melanie Bourdaa, with its 11 articles draws the

complex contemporary media landscape where audiences are sharing practices with professional media and even, changing roles, tasks and products. A perfect example of this approach is the article around the innovative concept of User-distributed Content (UDC) for media (Villi), with a clear claim to develop the engaging online relations of audiences more than their production of content. Fan phenomena (Hills, Berriman, García Avilés) and transmedia audiences (Grandío and Bonaut, Boccia Artieri) are key elements to understand the high levels of involvement in audiences around media products such TV series. The main point of Matt Hills is around brand *fanagement*: “Trans-transmedia does not simply unite fandom and franchise; rather, it seeks to appropriate fan discourses in order to protect the ‘hub’ of a TV series and its brand value” (p. 425). A key scenario is also Twitter and its negotiation of power and meaning. The study of Lucy Bennett is related to this topic, with the case study on the England riots in 2011. As she pointed out, “social media is altering the viewing experience for some television audiences quite considerably” (p. 511). The selection and circulation of information is everyday a more and more cooperative process between media, programmes and audiences, thanks to social media and networks. This issue is constantly underlining this idea, with other articles such as the ones of Vobič (online journalism), Cordeiro (radio and media convergence) or Lin (the case of BBC Backstage).

WG2 has collected interviews and essays in two additional volumes, that have not been published in the Participants special issue:

- Alternative Media and Participation, edited by Beybin Kejanlıoğlu and Salvatore Scifo (available at: <http://www.cost-transforming-audiences.eu/system/files/alternative%20media%20and%20participation-19-02-14.pdf>), and

- Audience Interactivity and Participation - Interviews with Practitioners, edited by Marie Dufrasne and Geoffroy Patriarche (available at: http://www.cost-transforming-audiences.eu/system/files/essays-and-interviews_practitioners.pdf).

.....

“Special Section: COST - audience interaction & participation” in Participations. Journal of audience and reception studies, 2013, volume 10, issue 1.

Available at: <http://www.participations.org/Volume%2010/Issue%201/contents.htm>

Report by Birgit Stark

The Special Section “COST - Audience Interaction & Participation” was edited by Manuel José Damásio, Mélanie Bourdaa, Bożena I. Mierzejewska, Ana Milojević, José Manuel Noguera, Birgit Stark, Lucia Vesnić-Alujević, and Igor Vobič. It was published in *Participations. Journal of Audience & Reception Studies*, Vol 10, No 1 (2013). The Special Section consists of a unique selection of altogether 23 self-authored and interview essays. The editors succeeded in bringing together top-gear representatives of media corporations, academic researchers, politicians, as well as civil society members.

All of them address succinctly the theme of audience, interactivity, and participation. For example, Birgit Stark (University of Mainz, Germany) in conversation with Ina von Holly (WE DO communication Berlin, Germany) explores social media as a reward for companies and the benefits of CSR in the social web. Stephen Harrington, Tim Highfield and Axel Bruns (all from Queensland University, Australia) tackle the relationship between television and Twitter. They address questions such as “Can tweets be a form of TV audience research?” and “Can tweeting be a new form of live television experience?” and point to the need for more research in these directions. To give a third example, Aleksandra Krstić (University of Belgrade, Serbia) elaborates on how television journalists can be influenced by their audiences. Herself a journalist, Krstić gives a highly interesting account of “a true transformation of my own journalistic practice in a TV program production” by audience participation via social media and other new electronic media outlets. She concludes that audience members have nowadays two roles: the role of the consumer and the role of the producer of information. Both “should be the core of every serious media outlet’s strategy”, she argues. Overall, these 3 and the other 20 contributions explore many different facets of the relationships between the concepts of audience, interactivity, and participation. Highly readable, up-to-date, and international, they offer exciting insights from the stakeholder perspective into the transformation of audiences.

.....

“New media, audience and emotional connectivity” in Sociedad de la Información, 2013, nr. 44.

Available at: http://www.sociedadelainformacion.com/cost_2013/specialissue_44.pdf

Report by José-Manuel Noguera Vivo

This special issue, edited by Hada M. Sánchez Gonzales, emerges from Working Group 2 (Audience interactivity and participation) with 10 articles and an innovative point of view: the emotional elements of audiences related to their feelings of belonging to media. With a special focus on digital media and the Web 2.0 ecosystem, the audience practices are analyzed from classic paradigms such the roles of media watchdogs and producers of content (prosumers). Digital journalism, political infotainment, radio and social media are some of the fields where this special issue tries to underline the relevance of emotional contacts between professionals and amateurs (audiences), especially in order to strengthen relations or paths for sharing information. This issue is offering many empirical approaches from national and international funded projects. The first article, focused on the platform Youtube and the political infotainment, confirmed that into this genre, humour is the main characteristic in the most famous political videos. Digital enthymemes concerning celebrities are also analyzed, as moralistic comments, to find out what kind of moral rhetoric is involved in this process. One of the results underlined that moralistic enthymemes are typical surrounding gossip

about domestic violence and celebrities (p. 58). The case study on The Guardian’s open journalism model, which (again) is underlined as example of one of the best and most innovative approaches to digital collaborative journalism (p. 194), as well as the article about the “hegemonic fictions” for audiences made by media (p. 237), with the fictions of choice, participation or objectivity, are also both interesting reflections of this issue.

.....

Special issue on “Managerial issues related to audience transformation and production”, in Budapest Management Review, 2014, vol. 44, nr. 2.

Available at: <http://corvinus-mba.hu/hungarian/vezetetestudomany/>

Report by Igor Vobič

This special issue, edited by Nóra Nyíró and Mihály Gálík, deals with the cross media production and audience involvement belong to the main areas of interest, topics include, among others, the changing role of audiences influencing the management of media companies; media uses, appropriations that are challenging cross media production processes; trends of audience fragmentation and disappearing audiences.

The introductory paper by Zsolt Varga and Nóra Nyíró aims to identify actual media audiences of different mass- and non-mass media types through identifying those audience clusters consuming not different but

differentiable media mixes. A major concern of the study is to highlight the transformation of mass media audiences when technology, digitalization and participation behavior are able to reshape traditional audience forms and media diets, which may directly affect the traditional media value chain and in turn the thinking and decision making of media managers.

In her article Daiva Siudikiene argues that the internet is defined as highly democratic medium, which is growing at the result of media users' generated content. Theoretical insights of various authors regarding improvement of media users-generated content quality are discussed in the article. This problem reflects not only ever-changing media use models but is also related with fierce discussions on media regulation issue. Developing initiatives reveal attempts to deal with media content quality issues and encourage more frequent discussions of how it should be done and how it could affect the modes of interaction between media companies and media users in the future.

Tamas Csoras and Mirko Gati acknowledge that in the new social media context, it is gradually more common to say that each party can itself be considered a media content provider, firms included (through their brand pages). This tendency is reflected in a rising professional field called "content marketing". This study incorporates the perspective of small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) into the scope of social media (SM) as a marketing communications and media content distribution system. This study's results show that diffusing content generally acts for SMEs as a facilitator to

involve fans by offering a thematized space for them to manifest themselves in company-related topics. Therefore, content adds to the firms' possibilities of brand positioning by offering a reflection of fans' company- and content-related behavior, which is a supplementary source of information.

Angela Chang argues that the audiences of performing arts events are changing, together with wider economic and cultural changes. A survey of three folklore performances was conducted in 2008, and yielded a response of 1,470 theater audience members in Taiwan. Traditional folklore performances are usually seen as appealing by old male viewers. However, the findings showed that the audiences of the performances comprised fewer men and a considerable number of women. With the successful transformation of the art organization in relationship marketing, young and collegiate respondents were shown to be frequent and loyal viewers of his folklore performance.

The focus of the paper by Bokor Tamas is brand destruction, however in a slightly different sense than the traditional marketing literature depicts it. The concept of brand destruction basically tends to be discussed either (1) as an accidental, counter-productive event in a campaign which leads to the ruining of the brand, or (2) an intentional act by competitors in the market, which results the same breakdown mentioned above. As this paper shows, there are other ways to consider as well, when speaking about brand destruction.

The article title *Winning Media Strategies in the Time of the Economic* written by

Crisis Dora Horvat, Ariel Mitev and Andras Bauer Research points to realignment in media spending namely better-targeted communications programs and more fragmented media choice, and besides, show the increasing role of audience participation, too. Authors argue that careful managerial efforts for harmonizing consumer problems and advertising content may result in finding the path from problem level to desired level in marketing communication practices even in crisis periods.

.....

“Histories of media(ted) participation”, CM, Communication Management Quarterly, 2014, vol. 9, nr. 2.

Available at: <http://www.cost-transforming-audiences.eu/system/files/pub/CM30-SE-Web.pdf>

Report by Ana Milojević

The special issue on “Histories of media(ted) participation”, edited by Nico Carpentier and Peter Dahlgren, in the forthcoming spring number of the journal CM, Communication Management Quarterly, no 30, 2014, is one of the final publications of the COST Action IS0906 “Transforming Audiences, Transforming Societies”. This special issue took on a challenge to combine historical research with the study of participatory media. The six articles in this special issue aim to further our knowledge about the history of media participation. Embedded in the historical research they all focus on the 20th and 21st century histories of participation.

Moreover, half of them write contextualized histories of the digital. Arguably, this is an indication that it might be time to abandon the concept of ‘new media’ and replace it by ‘online media’ and/or ‘digital media’. But these articles are also indicators of the importance of writing histories of the internet, connecting them with the analyses of other societal evolutions. Amongst the three articles that focus on the digital, is first of all Francesca Pasquali’s “For an archeology of online participatory literary writing”, which deals with the history of hypertext (and hyperfiction). Secondly, Dennis Beckers and Peter van den Besselaar analyze the history of Amsterdam’s three digital cities in “The tales of the three digital cities of Amsterdam: The application of ICT for social and political participation”. And finally, also Igor Vobič’s article, “Historicising the journalist-audience relationships in the internet era: A case study of the Slovenian newspaper Delo”, is situated in the digital era, with its analysis of how a Slovenian newspaper has organized audience participation and conceptualized their audience(s) from the mid-1990s onwards. These three articles each show, in their own ways, the interconnections between the online and different other societal fields, such as the cultural, the political and the journalistic. Moreover, they also demonstrate the complexities, fluidities and limitations of specific participatory practices. The three other articles in this special issue move towards earlier media forms. Fausto Colombo’s article, “Wrong turns towards revolution? Grassroots media and political participation in Italy (1967-2012)”, takes a long-term and bird’s eye perspective on the connection between political and

media participation, paying attention to a variety of media, including film, radio and the internet. In “Fighting for a regime change through active listening”, Nelson Ribeiro analyzes the ways that Portuguese listeners interacted with the BBC during World War II, in their attempts to change the broadcasting policies and content. The last article, “Propaganda, critical media literacy and participation: Tracing memories of the Soviet media”, by Natalija Mažeikienė and Kristina Juraitė, shifts the attention to a history where participation was not allowed, and analyzes how some of the prerequisites of participation were still present. Again, in these articles we can also find the complexities of participation, combined with the hopes and disappointments that participatory processes inevitably entail.

.....

“Policy implications of academic research on mediated participation” in *Comunicazioni Sociali*, 2013, vol. 35, nr. 3.

Available at: <http://www.vponline.it/riviste/comunicazionisociali/2013/3/>

Report by Maria Francesca Murru

This special issue, edited by Maria Francesca Murru and Nico Carpentier, stems from the debate that has been developed within the Cost Action ISO906 Transforming Audiences Transforming Societies (TATS) around the policy implications of scientific knowledge produced in the field of audience research. One of the main objectives of the research activities of the TATS Cost Action is to

produce rigorous empirical knowledge on the more challenging topics of current mediascapes, as media participation, determining trustworthiness, vulnerable or gullible audience segments, which is also beneficial to all these stakeholders.

This purpose has been achieved through the development of a multi-faceted debate □ comprising both theoretical conceptualizations and dialogical exchanges with stakeholders □ on the kind and value of the contributions that academia as a critical and semi-autonomous field can make to external societal arenas, like civil society, institutions and areas of production.

The issue on “The Responsibility of Knowledge” has been conceived as both a place to collect the reflections on social relevance of participatory theory (conducted within the Working Group 2 on “Audience interactivity and Participation” of TATS) and a chance to relaunch the debate addressing a wider public which is interested in the topics of academia’s social relevance and critical role but has not been involved before in TATS’ research activities. This two-folded rationale is reflected in the special issue’s structure that is divided into two sections. The first one, entitled “Building bridges”, collects papers produced and discussed by TATS researchers. The second one, “Critique and social relevance”, includes papers that were collected through an open call which asked for contributions analysing how the values of critique and social relevance are currently deployed in the contemporary research of communication and culture.

.....

“Participatory Journalism: Possibilities and Constrains for Audience Participation”, *Medijska istraživanja/Media Research*, 2013, vol. 19, nr. 2.

Available at: http://hrcak.srce.hr/index.php?show=toc&id_broj=9184

Report by Igor Vobič

In late modern societies, communication is shaped by concepts such as heterogeneity, fragmentation and individualisation. Social networking sites, blogs, and micro-blogs have recently joined the billions of websites enabling different individual and collective actors that are scattered across the locales to participate in public communication in a variety of unprecedented ways. These online forms of communicative engagement have also facilitated the ideas of the collaborative and the collective in contemporary journalism of traditional media organisations. The “people formerly known as the audience”, as Jay Rosen acknowledged almost a decade ago, have actively started to contribute to the on-going processes of creating news websites in mainstream media and became variously engaged in participatory journalism, which is also known as the “user-generated content”, “pro-am journalism”, and “citizen-engaged press”, among other phrases. Despite the fact that the idea of participatory journalism engages people both inside and outside the newsrooms to communicate, not only to, but also with each other, there have been indications of inclusivist, and also exclusivist principles and practices, of collective and collaborative news making.

Considering the possibilities and the constraints for audience participation, can we speak about the dominant models of participatory journalism or the common modes of audience-engaged news-making across the locales? How has audience conceiving among journalists shifted? How has conceiving of journalists among people changed? How have these dynamics reshaped the prevailing roles of journalists in society? How has the notion of the audience from the mass media world been transformed? The authors of the articles that have been included in this special issue of *Medijska istraživanja/Media Research*, edited by Igor Vobič, consider these and other questions to be the starting points of their explorations. The issue consists of five scholarly articles: one theoretical discussion on participatory journalism in the Internet age, and four case studies from the Netherlands, Slovenia, Serbia, and Belgium.

REPORTS ON WG2 BOOKS

Patriarche, Geoffroy, Helena Bilandzic, Jakob Linaa Jensen & Jelena Jurišić (2013). Audience Research Methodologies. Between Innovation and Consolidation. London & New York: Routledge.

Report by Lucia Vesnic-Alujevic

The COST Conference on the theme “New Challenges and Methodological Innovations in European Media Audience Research”, organized jointly by ECREA, IAMCR and ICA was held in Zagreb, Croatia, 7-9 April 2011. The selected conference papers that reflect on methodological agenda of audience research nowadays have been published in this book. Its goal is to contribute to the development of the repertoire of methods and methodologies in audience research.

In the audience research today, there is a need for creativity and dialogue between different research traditions. However, the discussion on research methods in this book goes beyond techniques and instruments. The book consists of four parts and a conclusion and each draws upon an empirical study. The first part looks at the development and strategies for diversification, integration and triangulation in a complex media environment. The second part deals with methodological developments where the perspectives of the researched and researchers reconcile. Part III is related to the study of Social network sites and different methodological issues that are put in front of researchers. This part starts from

the assumption that some SNSs are object-oriented, towards content creation and sharing while the others are oriented towards self-disclosure, socializing and networking. Part IV deals with the internet as a research tool, the medium’s influence on data quality as well as the issues of confidentiality and anonymity in an online environment. It also addresses the co-evolution of media technologies and social practices.

The concluding chapter summarizes different approaches and offers three main ideas that are on the agenda for further methodological development, namely: “communicating media”, “communicating audiences”, “communicating researchers”. It also gives three words that reflect different chapters of this book: “holistic”, seen in the difficulty to look at the use of a single media product without (un)mediated environments where people interact and participate, “relational”, as the relationship between researched and researcher, and “participatory”, as the participatory ambitions oriented towards a participatory culture.

Carpentier, N., Kim C. Schröder, Lawrie Hallett (2014). Audience Transformations: Shifting Audience Positions in Late Modernity. New York: Routledge.

Report by José-Manuel Noguera Vivo

Uses, structures, types of participation and conditions for participation are the big four parts of this collective book, which is the

work of 13 Task Forces and their writing teams within the COST Action TATS. As the result of this effort, we have a complex and heterogeneous systematization of how the contemporary social changes can be explained from the point of view of the audiences.

During the first part focused on the uses (*Using the Media*), the cross-media phenomena is a key element to understand how contemporary audiences are living with media and how the consumption is changing towards a blurred and complex scenario. With different empirical approaches, the key element is “the premise that media users combine different media within their everyday lives” (p. 26). Chapters around the concepts of genre and family are the final ones in the part on uses of media.

The second part analyses the structures of audiences in terms of networks, minorities and generations. The social construction of identity and the concept of media generations are leading the first chapter of this part, underlining the need of “a comprehensive model of media generations taking into account the specifics of media” (p. 78). The ethnic minorities for public and private television broadcasting are analyzed from the following evidence as starting point: there is a clear dissatisfaction among ethnic minorities towards national media institutions. Finally, networks are systematized from exciting ideas such as: “if I belong to a network, if I am part of it, then that network also belongs to me” (p. 103).

The part III and IV of this book are focused

on the differences between participation *in* and *through* the media, as well as the prerequisites of participation, in terms of access, literacy and trust.

Zeller, Frauke, Cristina Ponte, Brian O’Neill (forthcoming). Revitalising Audience Research. Innovations in European Audience Research. New York: Routledge.

Report by Frauke Zeller

The revitalisation of audience studies is not only about new approaches and methods; it entails a crossing of disciplines and a bridging of long-established boundaries in the field. The aim of this volume is to capture the boundary-crossing processes that have begun to emerge across the discipline in the form of innovative, interdisciplinary interventions in the audience research agenda. Contributions to this volume seek to further this process through innovative, audience-oriented perspectives that firmly anchor media engagement within the diversity of contexts and purposes to which people incorporate media in their daily lives, in ways often unanticipated by industries and professionals.





Working Group 2
"Audience Interactivity
and Participation"

**Transforming
Audiences,
Transforming
Societies**