

# Mediatisation of Culture and Everyday Life

An international research workshop

Hotel Skeppsholmen Stockholm Sweden 23–24 April 2015

Organised by Riksbankens Jubileumsfond sector committee  
'Mediatisation of Culture and Everyday Life' in cooperation with  
the ECREA Temporary Working Group 'Mediatization'

This workshop prioritises cultural perspectives in both the aesthetic and the anthropological sense, attending to arts and cultural industries as well as cultural practices of making sense in/of their daily lives. Three themes are of particular interest:

(1) Intermedial *comparisons* between different media forms, cultural fields and realms of everyday life, so as to balance media specificity with general media trends, overcome disciplinary compartmentalisation between different humanities, and open up for linking the cultural sector to the lifeworlds of civil society at large. How has mediatisation been studied in different fields and spheres of culture and everyday life?

(2) Intertemporal *histories* making comparisons and studying processes across larger time spans, including ideas of remediation and recontextualisation that allow breaking up simplistic linear narratives and contrasts between past and present. How has mediatisation unfolded over time, and how is it related to other types of transformations, such as modernisation, globalisation, commodification or individualisation?

(3) Interdisciplinary *critiques* that not only describe mediatisation processes but also scrutinise their social, individual and ethical impact on culture and everyday life. How are emancipatory and authoritarian potentials balanced in contemporary mediatisation processes? How can media-related transformations on the societal macro level be linked to experiential spaces and modes of socialisation on an individual micro level?

[www.rj.se/en/About-RJ/Sector-Committees/Mediatisation-of-culture-and-everyday-life](http://www.rj.se/en/About-RJ/Sector-Committees/Mediatisation-of-culture-and-everyday-life)

[www.mediatization.eu](http://www.mediatization.eu)

[www.hotelskeppsholmen.com](http://www.hotelskeppsholmen.com)



RIKSBANKENS  
JUBILEUMSFOND  
STIFTELSEN FÖR HUMANISTISK OCH  
SAMHÄLLSVETENSKAPLIG FÖRSKNING



# Preliminary programme

Thursday 23 April

09:15 Introduction (Göran Blomqvist, Stig Hjarvard & Johan Fornäs)

09:30 **Keynote A:** *Comparisons* (moderator Anne Jerslev)

- Emily Keightley (Loughborough UK): 'Comparing Experience: The Possibilities and Challenges for Comparative Mediatisation Research'

10:30 Coffee

11:00 **Paper session 1:** *Comparisons and Intermedialities* (moderator Anne Jerslev)

- Stig Hjarvard (Copenhagen DK) & Knut Lundby (Oslo NO): 'A Typology of Mediatized Conflictual Social Interaction'
- Jørgen Bruhn (Linné University SE): 'Novel-to-Film Adaptation: A Possible Specification of the "Mediatisation" Concept'
- Nicole Falkenhayner (Freiburg DE): 'CCTV Images as Cultural Artefacts: Theories of Mediatisation, and What We learn from Them for the Analysis of the Medial Sense-Making of Reality'
- Mikkel Fugl Eskjær (Aalborg DK/Bangladesh): 'Mediatization and Everyday Media: A Non-Western Perspective'

12:30 Lunch

13:30 **Paper session 2:** *Histories and Everyday Life* (moderator Anne Kaun)

- Friedrich Krotz (Bremen DE): 'Upcoming Media – Establishing Media: From Technology and Social Needs and Demands to the Apparatus in Culture and Society'
- Orvar Löfgren (Lund SE): 'Domesticating Media'
- Steffen Lepa & Anne-Kathrin Hoklas (Berlin DE): 'Socio-Material Practice Theories as a Third Way in Mediatization Research: Explaining the Lifecycle of Collectively Shared Long-Term Media Habits with Audio Media'
- Signe Opermann (Södertörn SE): 'Rethinking Perceived Generational Time'

15:00 **Keynote B:** *Histories* (moderator Johan Fornäs)

- John Durham Peters (Iowa USA): 'Mediatisation: Modern Time and Deep Time'

16:00 Coffee

16:30 **Paper session 3:** *Histories and Temporalities* (moderator Pelle Snickars)

- Anders Ekström (Uppsala SE): 'Time and the Rediscovery of Disaster'
- Jukka Kortti (Helsinki FI): 'From Chap Books to Spreadable Media: Mediatisation, History and Modern Everyday Life'
- Ulrik Volgsten (Örebro SE), Alf Björnberg (Göteborg SE), Toivo Burlin (Dalarna SE) & Tobias Pontara (Göteborg SE): 'Everyday Devices: Mediatisation, Disciplining and Localisation of Music in Sweden 1900–1970'
- Mads Krogh (Aarhus DK) & Morten Michelsen (Copenhagen DK): 'Music, Radio, and Mediatization'

18:00 **Poster Session**

- Jonas Andersson Schwarz & Johan Hammarlund (Södertörn SE): 'Social Media Bias, Flawed Remediation, and Imagined Populations'
- Göran Bolin (Södertörn SE): 'Mediatized Memories in Intergenerational and Cross-Cultural Relations: The Analysis of Mediatization as a Long-Term Process'
- Stine Liv Johansen (Aarhus DK): 'Play with Media across Time and Space'
- Abbas V. Kazemi & Hamed T. Kia (Tehran IR): 'Semi-Sacred and Profane Lifestyle: Iranian Multi Faces and the Internet'

18:30 **ECREA meeting** (chair Stig Hjarvard)

19:30 Dinner

## Friday 24 April

09:30 **Keynote C: Critiques** (moderator André Jansson)

- Mikko Lehtonen (Tampere FI):  
‘Power Relations beyond “Immediacy” and “Mediation”’

10:30 Coffee

11:00 **Paper session 4: Everyday Life and Identities** (moderator Karin Fast)

- Stina Bengtsson (Södertörn SE): ‘An Ethics of Ambiguity in a Culture of Connectivity?’
- Caroline Roth-Ebner (Klagenfurt AT): ‘The Efficient Worker and the Technologies of the Self’
- Maja Sonne Damkjær (Aarhus DK): ‘Studying the Impact of Mediatization Processes on Everyday Life through the Lens of Life Transitions’
- Sander De Ridder (Ghent BE): ‘The Mediatisation of Intimacy in Youth Cultures: Sexualities, Desires and Relationships as Digital Media Practices’

12:30 Lunch

13:30 **Paper session 5: Critiques and Contestations** (moderator Mats Ekström)

- Ines Braune (Marburg DE): ‘From TV-Produced Documentaries about the Actors to Self-Produced Digital Videoclips from the Actors: Mediatized Cultural Practices of Parkour Contest Forms of Representation and Participation’
- Tamara Witschge (Groningen NL) & Kaouthar Darmoni (Amsterdam NL):  
‘Counterpublics in the Age of Mediatisation: Local Responses to Femen in Ukraine and the Arab World’
- Marian T. Adolf (Zeppelin University DE): ‘The Epistemology of Mediatization’
- Sigrid Kannengießner (Bremen DE): ‘Questioning Mediatisation’

15:00 Coffee

15:15 **Panel: Conclusions** (moderator André Jansson)

- Knut Lundby (Oslo NO)
- Emily Keightley (Loughborough UK)
- Anne Kaun (Södertörn SE)
- Friedrich Krotz (Bremen DE)

16:30 Departure

**Note for authors:** Papers and posters need not be distributed in advance. We will after the workshop consider some form of (voluntary) publication, but at this stage, only oral presentations need to be prepared.

Each paper has maximum 15 minutes for presentation, so that there is 30 minutes joint discussion time at the end of each paper session.

Posters are to be brought printed in A2 format and pinned to a specific wall at the workshop; during the Thursday evening poster slot, authors will be there to discuss them with interested participants.

# Abstracts

## Keynote A: *Comparisons*

---

### **Emily Keightley: 'Comparing Experience: The Possibilities and Challenges for Comparative Mediatisation Research'**

This paper explores the challenges and possibilities of doing comparative research which explains the differences in the lived experiences of interrelations between media, social life, structures and systems and broader cultural practices and processes. As Hallin and Mancini have noted, the purpose of comparative media research is to 'explain why we have the media we have'. For mediatisation scholars it should be to explain why we have the particular relationships between media, social life and culture we have'. While mediatisation research routinely makes claims about change over time in these interrelations there have been few formal empirical comparative analyses which have sought to systematically account for temporal/historical differences and even fewer studies which have sought to make other kinds of synchronic comparisons such as spatial or technological comparisons. At an institutional level this omission is more readily rectified through further empirical research, but at a micro level where the object of comparison is the quality of our experience of these interrelations rather than their structural features this challenge is not so easily met. It requires revisiting the purposes and practices of comparative research and their applicability to complex, subjective and often ephemeral mediated experiences. This paper attempts to open up to scrutiny the extent of this challenge for mediatisation scholars and, by reflecting on two examples of analysing mediated experience which attempt to compare different aspects of temporal experience, offer some tentative trajectories and approaches for future comparative research on mediated experience.

Emily Keightley is Senior Lecturer in Communication and Media Studies at Loughborough University. Her recent books include edited collections on time, media and modernity and research methods for memory studies, and a monograph on the mnemonic imagination. She is currently developing a comparative research project on the relationship between official and unofficial heritage in the UK and China.

## Keynote B: *Histories*

---

### **John Durham Peters: 'Mediatisation: Modern Time and Deep Time'**

One of the challenges and attractions of the concept of mediatisation is to treat the media as world-historical engines. In this paper I explore two time frames of mediatisation: the long revolution of modernity and the deeper time frame opened up by a increasing knowledge of human genetics, climate change, and anthropogenic fire control in order to consider media in their grandest possible roles as historical change agents of both the human and the nonhuman world. It is hoped that an effort to understand media in their intermediary role between nature and culture will make the concept of mediatisation both richer in historical range and ecological relevance. This talk is an experiment to see if we can push the concept from its strong sociological basis to environmental relevance as well.

John Durham Peters is A. Craig Baird Professor in the Department of Communication Studies at the University of Iowa. He has published widely on media history and theory, and in fields adjoining media studies such as film studies, music, philosophy, religious

studies and social theory. He is the author of many articles and chapters as well as *Speaking into the Air* (1999), *Courting the Abyss* (2005) and the forthcoming *The Marvelous Clouds: Toward a Philosophy of Elemental Media* (2015, [press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/M/bo20069392.html](http://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/M/bo20069392.html)). In 2013–2014 he was the Helsingin Sanomat Foundation Fellow at the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies.

## Keynote C: *Critiques*

---

### **Mikko Lehtonen: ‘Power Relations beyond “Immediacy” and “Mediation”’**

Various takes of ‘mediatisation’ are based on implicit or explicit notions of what is ‘mediation’. The most common conception of ‘mediation’ is that it is produced by separable agencies, the ‘media’. Another conception is that ‘mediation’ is not between the object and that to which it is brought, but in the object itself (Adorno 1967). The third standpoint sees that in the first view textual autonomy and in the second immediacy has been reified (e.g. Fornäs 2000). In this paper I discuss the second and third notions of ‘mediation’. I ask: Is it possible to develop such conceptualizations that would take seriously the necessarily mediated composition of immediacy? What is the role of human corporeality and sensuousness in here? How does the ‘disembedded embeddedness of media’ work in producing the real effects media has exactly because it is predominantly seen as a separable agency? In the second part of the paper I examine what consequences the three notions of ‘mediation’ have in understanding the role of ‘mediatisation’ in the power relations of late modern societies.

Mikko Lehtonen is Professor of Media Culture at the University of Tampere. His latest book is about the relations of the ‘real’ and ‘symbolic’. Lehtonen has recently directed two research projects funded by the Academy of Finland: The Power of Culture in Producing Common Sense (POWCULT) and Capitalizing Culture (CAPCULT).

## Paper Session 1: *Comparisons and Intermedialities*

---

### **Stig Hjarvard (Copenhagen DK) & Knut Lundby (Oslo NO): 'A Typology of Mediatized Conflictual Social Interaction'**

This paper tries to map how various dynamics of mediatized conflicts work in social interaction over media representation of religiously defined tensions. By this, it raises epistemological issues on mediatization of culture and everyday life. The challenges faced in the new research project "Engaging with Conflicts in Mediatized Religious Environments" (CoMRel) will be related to the three forms of mediatized conflicts that are identified by Eskjær, Hjarvard and Mortensen (forthcoming): In interaction with social, political and cultural factors – media may come to *amplify*, to *frame and perform*, or to *co-structure* conflicts. These three dynamics of mediatized conflicts apply to conflicts over religion. CoMRel is a comparative Scandinavian study that aims to examine how religion in public spaces become thematised and enacted through the media and further articulated in social interaction, both as object of conflict and resources to handle tensions.

[www.hf.uio.no/imk/english/research/projects/comrel/index.html](http://www.hf.uio.no/imk/english/research/projects/comrel/index.html). CoMRel refers to culture as "the sphere within which various groups and individuals think, communicate and act" – as a "prerequisite" underlying the formation of society, to be grasped through "the interaction between people and their surroundings" (SAMKUL 2011: 11–12). Tensions and conflicts over religion have become frequent and are to a large extent played out in the media and with the media. Mediatized parts of contemporary religious environments have themselves become cultural prerequisites for societal change. The CoMRel project intends to refine the theory on mediatization of religion when it comes to the roles regular media users, i.e. people, play in the communication dynamic through their interpretations and interactions with representations in the media. The project will study conflicts over religion in three different arenas:

- How does *public service broadcasting* provide space for or control the visibility of actors, perspectives and issues related to conflicts around religion?
- How do conflicts about religious diversity that are thematised in mass media and in social media, shape the interactions between actors in *local communities*?
- How do teachers and pupils in classroom situations in secondary *public schools* engage with conflicts around religion that are thematised and made visible in mediatized representations?

We have both been concerned with social interaction as a way to understand and specify mediatization processes (e.g. Hjarvard 2013, Lundby 2009). In this paper we want to build a typology for how to study mediatization through conflictual social interaction, applying the outline for the CoMRel project as a case. This relates to the intermedial comparisons in the call as conflictual social interaction implies interplay between mass media, social media and face-to-face communication. The paper also relates to interdisciplinary critiques, as media studies over mediatized religious conflicts have to take into account critique of mediatization from religious studies.

### *References*

Eskjær, Mikkel; Hjarvard, Stig and Mortensen, Mette (forthcoming) "Three Dynamics of Mediatized Conflicts", in Eskjær, Mikkel; Hjarvard, Stig and Mortensen, Mette (eds). *The Dynamics of Mediatized Conflicts*. Peter Lang.

Hjarvard, Stig (2013). *The Mediatization of Culture and Society*. Routledge.

Lundby, Knut (2009). *Mediatization: Concept, Changes, Consequences*, Chapter 5. Peter Lang.

SAMKUL (2011). Work programme 2011–2020. Research Council of Norway.

---

**Jørgen Bruhn (Linné University SE): 'Novel-to-Film Adaptation: A Possible Specification of the "Mediatisation" Concept'**

From the point of view of "intermedial studies" the term "mediatisation" (mostly focused on the fields of culture and mass communication) needs specification and critical exemplification from the areas of arts and aesthetics. In my presentation I aim to discuss one specific aspect of mediatisation, which may help to specify and diversify the concept. I hope to show that the process of media-transformation in general, and more specifically novel-to-film adaption, will suit this purpose.

Novel-to-film adaptation consists, in its core, of a negotiation of medium specificity versus the fixedness of medialities, and despite our conventional understanding of the distinct nature of the medialities of literature and cinema, historical investigations have demonstrated the interdependence of the two medialities, since the first public screenings more than one hundred years ago and up until our present day.

As is well known, early cinema was dominated by literary adaptations (in shorter formats at the beginning, later on developing into the 90 minutes feature form), and at the same time literature was deeply inflicted by the upcoming, competing narrative form of cinema. So in the same way that conventional oil painting changed radically with the invention of photography, even narrative literature transformed in fundamental ways when facing a possible medial competitor.

With the so-called digitalization of western societies this tendency seems to be accentuated, and the content and form of hitherto relatively distinct medialities now occurs in blurred and possibly confusing ways. A contemporary crime novel, say, the Swedish author "Kepler" is, in form and content, apparently already formatted to be unproblematically turned into a film adaptation. The film adaptation can, in legal or semi-legal digitalized forms, flow between several media platforms, including a multiplex, a mobile-phone, a TV-screen or a computer screen.

Opening my analytical section with a short remark on French writer Marcel Proust's attack on literary "cinematography" I will move on to discuss a little more in depth the French novel *Cinéma* by Tanguy Viel from 1999 (which is a novelization of 1972 thriller *Sleuth*) in contrast to Kenneth Branagh's 2007 remake or adaptation of the 1972 film.

Intermedial studies may offer helpful tools to investigate the intricate workings of technical media, aesthetic medialities, phenomenological sensibilities and cultural forms, thus being informed by but also supplementing the broader theoretical and historical framework of mediatisation.

---

**Nicole Falkenhayner (Freiburg DE): 'CCTV Images as Cultural Artefacts: Theories of Mediatisation, and What We learn from Them for the Analysis of the Medial Sense-Making of Reality'**

Drawing from the research conducted for the interdisciplinary project "CCTV beyond Surveillance: The cultural life of surveillance camera images" funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG), this paper presents insights from various fields that were gathered in order to develop a methodology to describe the remediation of CCTV images in narrative cultural artefacts for various fields of sense-making. In the ongoing project, these include the use of surveillance camera footage in news stories, the use of iconic surveillance camera images as memory media, the use of CCTV as an aesthetic backdrop and plot-driver in British novels and film not part of the spy or detective genre, and the use of CCTV in narrative / visual art projects geared at an aesthetic experience "beyond surveillance".

Due to the aim of the project to show the breadth of cultural uses of surveillance images in multimodal narrative media environments, comparisons between insights and concepts of mediatisation can be made that make it possible to showcase both varying epistemological idioms for analysing mediatisation as well as their application for actual analysis. Specifically, the fields of surveillance studies, memory studies, narratology, German “Bildwissenschaften”, film studies and aesthetics propose different entry-points into regarding the role of mediatisations as practices of “making sense of reality” (De Nora 2014).

For example, in surveillance studies, mediatisations of surveillance camera images in broadcast television (Doyle 2006) ask about the specific gaze and affects elicited when control artefacts are transported into mediatized cultural sense-making. The mediatisation and remediation of memory is a growing sub-field within memory studies, asking how media enable (or disable) capacities for the creation of collective remembering (Erll & Rigney 2009). Deleuzian film studies have accessed “surveillance screens” as a part of new ways of viewing in the digital era (Pisters 2013). Aesthetics ask for the translation processes involved when media of different origins become intertwined (Rancière, Chow 2012), but also propose a “New Aesthetic” (...) that asks about affective connections between humans and control artefacts. Transmedial narratology (Ryan 2009) and the theory of narratology as a tool for cultural analysis (Bal 2009) propose very different entry-points into the study of multimodal and non-linguistic narratives.

The aim of the proposed paper is to showcase and compare different idioms of analysing mediatisation as a practice for making sense of “the real”. By strongly connecting theoretical entry-points with their applicability for a specific research question (the use of surveillance cameras in narratives for various cultural aims), the comparison that the proposed paper will undertake can outline the differences and convergences of theories of mediatisation as well as their respective usefulness for the cultural analysis of practices of mediating “the real”.

---

### **Mikkel Fugl Eskjær (Aalborg DK/Bangladesh): ‘Mediatization and Everyday Media: A Non-Western Perspective’**

This paper looks at the place of everyday media in processes of mediatization from an intercultural perspective. By comparing western and non-western media systems the paper investigates how everyday media activities take on different meanings and functions depending on the cultural and political context.

In general, it can be argued that processes of mediatization in most western countries have been driven by institutional adjustments to a media-saturated environment, resulting in institutional routines and practises adapting to media formats, news criteria and news cycles (often referred to as media logic). These transformations have been widely discussed and documented in relation to the political system and related institutional arenas. Over time, however, processes of mediatization have increasingly seeped into everyday life affecting activities such as consumption, children’s play, household economy, interpersonal relations, etc. Consequently, everyday actions have increasingly been shaped, moulded or attuned to media formats and media technologies.

In non-western media systems, especially in the Middle East and South Asia, the picture is quite different, to some degree representing almost the opposite pattern. Here mediatization is mostly driven by everyday media activities while institutional mediatization is less advanced. In these regions media systems are rarely fully independent of the political system resulting in well-known patterns of protocol news and (semi)authoritarian media content. As the political system rarely has to publicly



account for or legitimize its policies, political institutions have been much less concerned with adapting and adjusting to media formats and media routines.

Processes of mediatization have rather emerged in relation to everyday media activities such as transnational and mobile media consumption. In many LDC's (least developed countries) mobile media have profoundly effected social change. Well known examples include: Mobile time (e.g. minutes) as a new type of currency among poor people in East Africa; Mobile banking as a means to distribute micro-credits (e.g. in Bangladesh); Mobile information allowing farmers to check prices on locale markets before selling to dodgy middle-men; Mobile communication among immigrants and domestic workers supporting (for good or bad) the structures of a globalized workforce.

On a political level, everyday mediatization also have noticeable effects. While authoritarian regimes have traditionally been able to control national news they can do little to prevent people receiving transnational media, including uncensored newscasts from abroad. For a long time, authoritarian regimes in the Middle East tried to ban satellite television in order to control everyday news flows, just as autocratic regimes around the world are currently closing and restricting social media (e.g. Facebook, Twitter, Weibo) in order to prevent political mobilisation via mediatized social networks.

Thus, whereas mediatization in western countries is inseparable from processes of institutionalised professionalism and rationalisation, mediatization in non-western countries have different transformative effects because they primarily take place within the settings of everyday activities. This paper intends to unravel some of these differences, offering "the mediatization of everyday life" a new significance in the understanding of international processes of mediatization.

### References

- Altheide, D. L. (2004). Media Logic and Political Communication. *Political Communication*, 21(3), 293–296.
- Altheide, D. L., & Snow, R. B. (1979). *Media Logic*. London: Sage.
- Eskjær, M. F. (2013). Medialisering som mediespecifik moderniseringsproces. *Nordicom Information*, 35(3-4), 15–31.
- Hallin, D. C., & Mancini, P. (2004). *Comparing Media Systems. Three Models of Media and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Hallin, D. C., & Mancini, P. (Eds.). (2012). *Comparing media systems beyond the Western world*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hepp, A. (2012). Mediatization and the "molding force" of the media. *Communications*, 37, 1–28. doi:10.1515/commun-2012-0001
- Hepp, A., Hjarvard, S., & Lundby, K. (2010). Mediatization - Empirical perspectives: An introduction to a special issue. *Communications*, 35, 223–228.
- Hjarvard, S. (2013). *The Mediatization of Culture and Society*. London: Routledge.
- Jansson, A. (2002). The Mediatization of Consumption: Towards an analytical framework of image culture. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 2(5), 5–31.
- Kraidy, M. M. (2005). Reality TV and Politics in the Arab World: Preliminary Observations. *TBS*, (15).
- Lundby, K. (2009). *Mediatization. Concept, Change, Consequences*. NY: Peter Lang.
- Mazzoleni, G., & Schulz, W. (1999). "Mediatization" of Politics: A Challenge for Democracy? *Political Communication*, 16, 247–261.
- Rugh, W. A. (2004). *Arab Mass Media. Newspaper, Radio, and Television in Arab Politics*. Westport: Praeger.
- Rugh, W. A. (2012). Do National Political Systems Still Influence Arab Media? *Arab Media & Society, Volume/(2)*. Retrieved from <http://www.arabmediasociety.com/?article=225>
- Sakr, N. (2001). *Satellite Realms. Transnational Television, Globalization & the Middle East*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Sakr, N. (2007). *Arab Media and Political Renewal. Community, Legitimacy and Public Life*. London: I.B. Tauris.

- Schillemans, T. (2012). *Mediatization of Public Services. How Organisations Adapt to News Media*. Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang.
- Schulz, W. (2004). Reconstructing Mediatization as an Analytical Concept. *European Journal of Communication, 19*(1), 87–101.
- Sreberny, A. (2002). Media, Muslims, and the Middle East: A Critical Review Essay. *Political Communications, 19*, 273–280.
- Strömbäck, J. (2008). Four Phases of Mediatization: An Analysis of the Mediatization of Politics. *The International Journal of Press/Politics, 13*(3), 228–246.
- Strömbäck, J., & Dimitrova, D. V. (2011). Mediatization and Media Interventionism: A Comparative Analysis of Sweden and the United States. *The International Journal of Press/Politics, 16*(1), 30–49.

## Paper Session 2: *Histories and Everyday Life*

---

### **Friedrich Krotz (Bremen DE): 'Upcoming Media – Establishing Media: From Technology and Social Needs and Demands to the Apparatus in Culture and Society'**

Mediatization research is concerned with upcoming or changing media and a changing system of media, and its relation to changes in communication and everyday life of the people, structures and operations of institutions and organizations, and with developments of economy, democracy, culture and society as a whole. Obviously, the character of such a theory depends of the concept of media, on which it is grounded. In order to reconstruct, how media are coming into existence in a given culture and society, we must understand how a technology is invented and how it was used to serve for the demands of the people and thus was institutionalized as a media. For example, print culture was started as a technology, while the SMS has become a media by the not intended use of mobile phones by young people. We thus can describe the upcoming of a media in the perspective of media change and media development as the upcoming of opportunities and conditions of new forms of communication, which may come into existence by demands of the people, by the work of engineers and the economy, by control and rules of government or by institutions using already existing technologies for the creation of new aesthetic form, and may be, by further influences.

After their invention, these technologies and ways of use became institutionalized as media in the everyday of the people, with consequences for communication and social relations, institutions and organizations, culture and society. An approach to grasp this theoretically is the so called apparatus theory, developed by Jean-Louis Baudry and others, referring to Michel Foucault: a media then is a complex net of social and material conditions, laws and decisions of government and institutions, cultural rules and scientific arguments, expectations and habits, embedded into and directed by societal discourses. The apparatus "cinema" for example thus is quite different from the apparatus "television", and of course, an apparatus is a process, changing over time.

The presentation intends to define these concepts and to show by historical and actual examples like print culture, the radio and the Internet that they may be helpful to analyse the upcoming of new and the role and development of existing media. This for example shows that social movements have been able to use print media and radio after their invention for some time for their goals and purposes. But after some time, these media then become controlled by government and economy and/or church and other established institutions. What does this mean for the Internet of today?

---

### **Steffen Lepa & Anne-Kathrin Hoklas (Berlin DE): 'Socio-Material Practice Theories as a Third Way in Mediatization Research: Explaining the Lifecycle of Collectively Shared Long-Term Media Habits with Audio Media'**

Within communication studies, *long-term media habits* form a still under-theorized aspect of everyday media use: Uses and gratification models either neglect them or treat them as a given (LaRose, 2010), without being able to explain the psycho-social mechanisms of their individual development, temporal dynamics and societal distribution. Diffusion of Innovations theory (Rogers, 2003) and media generation approaches (Sackmann & Winkler, 2013) typically only differentiate between users and non-users of single new technologies and services. They also often overlook the reciprocal functional interaction of new and existing media, as well as the differing possible forms (the "how") of integrating new media technologies into everyday life (Karnowski, von Pape, & Wirth, 2011).

May Mediatization research fill this gap? Our contribution proposes that answers to growing demands for a stronger *explanatory* approach in Mediatization research with regards to *long-term societal change* (Deacon & Stanyer, 2014) may be found in what has been termed the “material perspective” (Lundby, 2014). Hence, we refer to the *histories* and *critiques* areas of the CfP. Our central claim is that the endeavor of the *material perspective* maybe re-read as the quest for identifying and describing the social mechanisms and consequences of *habitus formation alongside the enculturation with ever-changing material media technologies*.

In order to explain how media habits are formed and transformed alongside mediatization, our approach draws on ideas of practice theories (Shove, 2012) the sociology of knowledge (Kilminster, 1993), activity theory (Vianna, 2006) and ecological psychology (Hutchby, 2001). Within the framework of the German research priority program “Mediatized Worlds”, an empirically-grounded model of the development and dynamics of long-term media habits was developed (Lepa, Hoklas, & Weinzierl, 2014). It assumes that actors acquire a cohort- and milieu-specific *modus operandi* of lifeworld-theme related technology use in interaction with the *technological affordances* of their surrounding media environments in the course of their formative years. This produces a “determination in the first instance” (Hall, 1986) in terms of a shared “media grammar” (Gumpert & Cathcart, 1985) which is upheld with certain *inertia* across life-span regardless of changes in the actual technologies employed for practically realizing it. Nevertheless, the acquired orientations may exhibit individual transformations due to intergenerational learning or critical changes in social life circumstances.

Our materialist, non-media centric approach (Morley, 2009) adheres to a critical-realist notion of causality (Lepa, 2013) and to the call for explanatory, mechanism-based approaches in Mediatization research (Driessens, 2014). It centers on “communicative figurations” (Hepp, 2013) of shared, trans- media habits that have been formed in collectively shared experiential media spaces (Lepa, Krotz, & Hoklas, 2014) during actor’s childhood and youth. On the empirical realm, these may be a) identified by the composition of individuals’ nowadays media menus via media repertoire analysis (Hasebrink & Popp, 2006) and b) explained in terms of their genesis by micro-level interpretive analyses of shared implicit habitual orientations articulated in biographic-episodic interviews (Nohl, 2010). Our presentation will give illustrative examples from our own research on the generational formation of habitual *music media orientations* which draws on the described approach.

### References

- Deacon, D., & Stanyer, J. (2014). Mediatization: key concept or conceptual bandwagon? *Media, Culture & Society*, 36(7), 1032–1044. doi:10.1177/0163443714542218
- Driessens, O. (2014). Conceptualising mediatisation as social change: A mechanism-based perspective. Presented at the 5th European Communication Conference, Lisbon, Portugal.
- Gumpert, G., & Cathcart, R. (1985). Media grammars, generations, and media gaps. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 2(1), 23–35.
- Hall, S. (1986). The Problem of Ideology - Marxism without Guarantees. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 10(2), 28–44.
- Hasebrink, U., & Popp, J. (2006). Media repertoires as a result of selective media use. A conceptual approach to the analysis of patterns of exposure. *Communications*, 31(3), 369–387.
- Hepp, A. (2013). The communicative figurations of mediatized worlds: Mediatization research in times of the “mediation of everything.” *European Journal of Communication*, 28(6), 615–629. doi:10.1177/0267323113501148
- Hutchby, I. (2001). Technologies, texts and affordances. *Sociology*, 35(02), 441–456. Karnowski, V., von Pape, T., & Wirth, W. (2011). Overcoming the binary logic of adoption: On the

- integration of diffusion of innovations theory and the concept of appropriation. In A. Vishwanath & G. Barnett (Eds.), *The Diffusion of Innovations. A Communication Science Perspective* (pp. 57–76). New York: Peter Lang.
- Kilminster, R. (1993). Norbert Elias and Karl Mannheim: Closeness and Distance. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 10(3), 81–114. doi:10.1177/026327693010003005
- LaRose, R. (2010). The Problem of Media Habits. *Communication Theory*, 20(2), 194–222. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2885.2010.01360.x
- Lepa, S. (2013). A critical realist approach to mediatization research. Presented at the “Mediatization & New Media”. International Research Workshop by ECREA TWG Mediatization, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Lepa, S., Hoklas, A.-K., & Weinzierl, S. (2014). Discovering and interpreting audio media generation units: A typological-praxeological approach to the mediatization of everyday music listening. *Participations - Journal of Audience & Reception Studies*, 11(2), 207–238.
- Lepa, S., Krotz, F., & Hoklas, A.-K. (2014). Vom ‚Medium‘ zum ‚Mediendispositiv‘: Metatheoretische Überlegungen zur Integration von Situations- und Diskursperspektive bei der empirischen Analyse mediatisierter sozialer Welten. In F. Krotz, C. Despotovic, & M. Kruse (Eds.), *Die Mediatisierung sozialer Welten: Synergien empirischer Forschung* (pp. 115–141). Wiesbaden: VS - Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Lundby, K. (2014). A pattern in social theories of change within mediatization research. Presented at the 5th European Communication Conference, Lisbon, Portugal.
- Morley, D. (2009). For a Materialist, Non-Media-centric Media Studies. *Television & New Media*, 10(1), 114–116. doi:10.1177/1527476408327173
- Nohl, A.-M. (2010). The Documentary Interpretation of Narrative Interviews. In R. Bohnsack, N. Pfaff, & V. Weller (Eds.), *Qualitative Analysis and Documentary Method in International Educational Research* (pp. 195–218). Opladen & Farmington Hills: Barbara Budrich.
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations [1962]* (5. Ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Sackmann, R., & Winkler, O. (2013). Technology generations revisited: The internet generation. *Gerontechnology*, 11(4). doi:10.4017/gt.2013.11.4.002.00
- Shove, E. (2012). Habits and their creatures. In A. Warde & D. Southerton (Eds.), *The Habits of Consumption* (Vol. 12, pp. 100–113). Helsinki: Collegium.
- Vianna, E. (2006). Embracing History through Transforming It: Contrasting Piagetian versus Vygotskian (Activity) Theories of Learning and Development to Expand Constructivism within a Dialectical View of History. *Theory & Psychology*, 16, 81–108. doi:10.1177/0959354306060108

---

### **Signe Opermann (Södertörn SE): ‘Rethinking Perceived Generational Time’**

In media studies, generational phenomena are becoming increasingly conceptualised on the basis of theories developed by Karl Mannheim, who thinks of generation as both “a product and maker of history”, i.e. an entity able to rediscover the individual experience of biographical time and transform the shared experiences into the time of “my/our generation”. Therefore, social generations cannot be reduced to other substitutes (cohorts, age groups, genealogical generations), since the generational paradigm involves several layers related to different perceptions of time (and space). A discussion on phenomenological analysis of time – understood as consciousness of past, present, and future – has been developed by Husserl, Heidegger, Ricoeur, etc. Ricoeur suggests that, aside from calendars and archives (as instruments for determining the passing flow of time), generation finds its sociological projection in the relationship between contemporaries. In the current case, the term *coevals* would be more suitable referring to people of approximately the same age, living through the same period of their life course and belonging to a particular social setting which may not necessarily be applicable to some other social group, as their *habitus(es)* are rather different. This paper discusses social generations as entities that define themselves through the process of generational formation (*generationing*), transforming “my time” to “our time” (approached as „internal time“, as opposed to “external” or objective time) under particular conditions during a period of change.

The paper derives from an empirical study on the “repertoires” of news media that different generations use to obtain information and create their everyday information space. Although the findings demonstrate remarkable differences between five cohort groups (composed on

the basis of birth year, societal changes and developments in the media landscape during the years from 1940 to 2012 in Estonia), the study also reveals that media behaviour is not necessarily divided by particular generational patterns, but changes also over the life course. Moreover, media repertoires are more than ever dispersed along individualized preferences; in different societies, the fragmentation of news media audiences occurs also across predominant language groups (e.g. Estonian, Russian) and other indicator sets such as education, social status, etc.

## Paper session 3: *Histories and Temporalities*

---

### **Anders Ekström (Uppsala SE): 'Time and the Rediscovery of Disaster'**

This paper explores the deep historical contexts for imagining natural disasters and extreme nature events. By focusing on a foundational event in the Western disaster imaginary – the eruption of Vesuvius in A.D. 79 – and its remediation across centuries and between media genres, the paper aims to suggest that the real-time aesthetic of the mediation of extreme nature events that now abounds in contemporary culture is profoundly embedded in processes of historical intermediality. For this reason, the term remediation is used in the paper to denote a genuinely historical mechanism by which past and present (old and new/process and event) are simultaneously made visible. The paper investigates the superimposition of temporal dimensions in a series of re-creations of the ancient eruption from the late eighteenth century to the present, and exemplifies how more recent disasters were imagined in cultural forms that emerged from the reception of the story of the fall of Pompeii. Using the insights gained from this spectacular case study, the paper argues that a re-temporalisation of historical analysis itself is needed for history to contribute to contemporary concerns with the present as a conjuncture of multiple and conflicting time scales.

---

### **Jukka Kortti (Helsinki FI): 'From Chap Books to Spreadable Media: Mediatisation, History and Modern Everyday Life'**

The inventing of printing press meant, among other things, that media could become a part of everyday life for others than just priests, clerks and scholars. This was, however, rather a slow process – “long revolution” as Raymond Williams puts it – but it started the privatization of everyday life. Nevertheless, it must be remembered that literacy concerned a small minority of the population until the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century in the western world, not to mention other parts of the globe. Although religious ‘multimedia’ has had an effect on people’s worldview especially in cathedrals long before the spread of mass literacy, only the creation of mass media started the real mediatisation of everyday life since the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. The rise of novel and tabloid press, and later in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century, the inventing of electric and audiovisual media meant that media became an integral part of aesthetic and cognitive sensing of the world. The modern mediatized world began.

In my presentation, I discuss the role media in modern history from the point of view of everyday life. I am particularly interested in how certain media technologies have effected on the lives of common people, such as the rise of popular literature in the form of chap books or the current social media applications. Through the media historical examples, I want not only to show the landmarks of the mediatisation process in everyday life but also the continuities which could be approached in reference to the concepts of digital media such as *remediation* and *intermediality*. I want emphasize that those concepts the digital media age creates, such as *spreadable media* (Jenkins etc. 2013), are not “revolutionists” after all. This is based on my main approach – a sort of an agenda – I have in my recently finished book on the history of media: media history should be seen more as an evolution than as series of revolutions.

I also discuss about the role of media in current *history culture*. The mediatisation – whether we see it as a process that effects on politics, science or culture – has undoubtedly had an important role in the making of *collective* (or *cultural*) memory and wider phenomenon of *consuming history*.

---

**Ulrik Volgsten (Örebro SE), Alf Björnberg (Göteborg SE), Toivo Burlin (Dalarna SE) & Tobias Pontara (Göteborg SE): 'Everyday Devices: Mediatisation, Disciplining and Localisation of Music in Sweden 1900–1970'**

The aim of this project is to show how the use of music devices interacted with and changed ideas about music, sound and listening during a period characterized by incessant mediatisation. Focus is on Sweden from 1900 to 1970. The turn of the century marks the beginning of private listening to phonograms, while by 1970 media such as gramophone, film and tape recorders had become part of the everyday lives of most Swedes.

The investigation is designed as four sub-projects, based on four overarching issues that simultaneously complement and mutually illuminate each other. Each sub-project articulates problems that to varying degrees actualize intermedial comparisons. Each highlight re-contextualising and re-mediating practices, as well as mutually influencing changes on cultural macro- and micro-level. Spanning seven decades (with forward glances as well as historical recaps) this project offers a long-term perspective on music practices and processes that are still largely unexplored. The four subprojects respectively focus on:

1) the emergence of the living-room as a central and everyday space in many homes, and how it provided a crucial economical outlet for the musical phonogram. The central question is how the living room became a space for musical listening practices associated with phonography, as compared with other more public spaces and media such as the radio. Allowing alternative histories depending on the specific media being studied, the answers point towards a radical questioning of Western music history, in that listening in everyday life and private spaces has been a largely neglected condition for the perception and apprehension of music.

2) Listening to phonograms was an activity that for a long time went hand-in-hand with home recording. Here the central issue is home based sound-production activities contributed to changes in the perception and apprehension of sound, music and listening. In addition, the question is raised in which everyday spaces this "other" activity (home recording) took place and how it was distinguished from the "first" activity in both spatial/practical and ideological/content respects.

3) Solitary listening to music in one's private living room was far from an obvious activity during the first decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century; generally, music was still a social activity. The study aims to identify the processes (discursive, disciplinary, etc.) that eventually lead to music's dominance as a content-category on the phonogram market. The central question is how the genre-classifications of the phonogram market, as well as what was written in advertising, newspapers and magazines, affected notions of how home-listening should be pursued, and of what (i.e. what kind of object) one was listening to.

4) This part of the project aims to show how sound film both reflected and came to serve as an important prerequisite for a range of new listening habits and attitudes that emerged in Sweden between 1930 and 1960. How did sound film – through its intermediation and representation of music devices and listening behaviour in everyday spaces and situations – influence the mediatisation-, disciplining-, and localization processes that music underwent in Sweden during the studied period?

By focusing on appliances, spaces and beliefs about music, in Sweden between 1900 and 1970, the project will contribute important knowledge about an area concerning many, but unknown to most: *how our perception and apprehension of music affect and is affected by music's mediatisation, disciplining and localization.*



---

**Mads Krogh (Aarhus DK) & Morten Michelsen (Copenhagen DK): 'Music, Radio, and Mediatization'**

20<sup>th</sup> century radio with its broadcast of live music and a bit later, recorded musics, was far from the first step in the developments of mass mediated music. And since the advent of radio several other technologies up until today have repeatedly changed the conditions for music production, dissemination, reception etc. and, in turn, influenced the relations between radio and music.

In this paper we would like to focus on one specific medium, radio, and ask how practices of radio and music(al life) influence each other. The questions will be asked within the framework of mediatization theories, especially as suggested by Andreas Hepp on the one hand and Stig Hjarvard on the other, and the intention is to investigate their potential for elucidating the music-technology-society nexus.

While the concept posits relevant perspectives for grasping overarching societal tendencies, it does not sit well with analytical perspectives that are more detailed than media in general. Radio is part of mediatization meta-processes but we will follow Deacon's & Stanyer's advice to supplement the concept of mediatization with "a series of additional concepts at lower levels of abstraction" (2014: 9).

Focusing on associations between music and radio at such lower levels of abstraction, i.e. within contexts of production or everyday consumption, we find a complex landscape of interaction, mediation, and affordances which challenges the media-specific dominance (or determinism) and linear historiography which tend to be foregrounded within narrations of mediatization. Alternatively, we suggest the specific object of our investigation may be grasped as heterogeneous milieu of music-radio, where notions of radio and music (along with a range of other political, economic, social, technological components) are transgressed, challenged or negotiated in concrete practices of production and use. Indeed, if the concept of mediatization has to do with media (institutions) influencing non-media areas of societal life, this influence would have to change our understanding of the media involved, thus manifesting a reciprocal mediation (or dialectic) of the components involved. 'Radiofication' of music(al life) may, thus, be said to imply a certain 'musicalization' of radio, giving way to new conceptions, conventions etc. with respect to both – or simply to various notions of music-radio. Furthermore, the generality of the notion of mediatization needs in this line of thought to be grasped by reference to those components and processes which stabilize and disseminate milieu of music radio.

We will suggest the neologism 'radiofication' for analysing the changes in the asymmetrical power relations between musical life and radio. This in order to contribute to a more detailed and not necessarily linear historiography of mediatization, to actually point out the complexities of the processes for example by addressing the influence of non-media institutions (industry and governments) as well, to be able to discern between different media and their influence on each other ('internetization', for example), and to highlight that the systems being mediatized influence media as well.

The theoretical discussion of this will be illustrated with examples from Danish radio history.

## Paper session 4: *Everyday Life and Identities*

---

### **Stina Bengtsson (Södertörn SE): 'An Ethics of Ambiguity in a Culture of Connectivity?'**

In her *An ethics of ambiguity* (1947) Simone de Beauvoir outlined the philosophical foundation for an ethics where individual freedom is in the center, but where acknowledgement of 'the other' is as important to assure for the possibility of human beings to live together in culture. At the background of the Second World War and the increasing tensions on social relations following from that she, as part of the broader school of existentialism, discussed an ethics where individual freedom is inevitably intertwined with the good life of 'the other' for the possibility of individuals to lead an ethically good life.

We have seen large societal and cultural transformations since then: processes of mediatization – understood as “a way of capturing the wider consequences of media’s embedding in everyday life” (Couldry & Hepp 2013 p. 195) – have largely changed how we live and interact in culture, not least how relations between individuals are connected in digital media environments. Following Jansson (2013) I here relate to mediatization as a way of understanding how “the appropriation of media changes social norms, conventions and expectations at the level of everyday practice” (p. 285). Hence, new media and networked culture have on the one hand enhanced our possibilities to connect to others and provide possibilities for its users’ to stay connected with others in daily life. At the same time, Jose van Dijk (2010, 2013) has pointed at an increasing mediatization of social relations and that technology, by way of social media sites as infrastructures of everyday life, define and redefine the way social relations today are formed (c.f. van Dijk 2013). Thus; although the increasing embeddedness of digital media in everyday life provide new possibilities for users to stay connected and to maintain closer relations to those they care for, the culture of connectivity also highlights how users are defined by their social habits and preferences online and how algorithms and technological structures define the framework for the construction and maintenance of social relations, ethical frameworks and new ways of acknowledging 'the other' in everyday life today.

In this presentation, I will scrutinize how an ethics of 'the other' is articulated in our culture of connectivity and in an increasingly mediatized everyday life. Based upon qualitative analyses of media user’s practices, routines, values, and ways of relating to others in online environments, this presentation critically examines the increasing mediatization of social relations in everyday life.

#### *References*

- de Beauvoir, Simone (1947/1976): *The ethics of ambiguity*. New York: Kensington Pub. Co.
- Couldry, Nick and Andreas Hepp (2013): Conceptualizing Mediatizations: Contexts, Traditions, Arguments. *Communication Theory* 23, p. 191-202.
- Jansson, André (2013): Mediatization and Social Space: Reconstructing Mediatization for the Transmedia Age. *Communication Theory*, 23 p. 279-296.
- van Dijk, José (2013): *The culture of connectivity: A critical history of social media*. New York: Oxford university Press.

---

### **Caroline Roth-Ebner (Klagenfurt AT): 'The Efficient Worker and the Technologies of the Self'**

Communication with media shapes and transforms social behaviour and culture, our space- and time related acting, our constructions of reality. This is the core thesis of the

concept of Mediatisation (Krotz 2003). In a recent study, the theory of Mediatisation was empirically explored in the field of office work, an area that is moulded to a large extent by the use of digital media. The so-called “Mediatisation of work” (Roth-Ebner 2013) is characterized by ongoing processes of virtualization, by global communication and networking, by processes of subjectification and by the dislimitation between professional and private spheres. The study focused on people who communicate intensively with digital media (so-called “Digicom Workers”). The research dealt with the question how the Digicom Workers meet the challenges of mediatized work. The research methodology followed a triangulation strategy and consisted of 20 qualitative interviews with intensive media users, their diaries of media use, and visualizations of their media use at work. Additional data was gained by conducting an online survey (N=445). The results disclosed that the Digicom Workers elaborate very individualized strategies and practices that are the consequence of concrete considerations, trials and experiences. The most important categories to emerge were the efficiency of the media use and the efficiency of work processes in general. This means strategies and intentions that promise a positive relation of effort and output. Regarding the study’s results as a whole, the existence of an “efficient worker” can be assumed in the form of a person who strives for efficient work and work-related communication in order to tackle a maximum of tasks. His/her values and complex professional acting are in line with the benchmark of efficiency. Digital media are his/her tools that help to efficiently organize, coordinate, conduct, evaluate and archive the work. In this regard, the “efficient worker” corresponds with the ideal type in Neoliberalism, the Entrepreneur of the Self (Bröckling 2007), pursuing an orientation in line with economical values and logics. The results concerning the efficient worker reveal that this leads to signs of exhaustion (Ehrenberg 2004). In order to examine the worker’s internalization of neoliberal values, Michel Foucault’s concept of Governmentality and the Governmentality studies that follow Foucault’s ideas will be drawn upon. Following Foucault (1996), the government combines technologies of domination and technologies of the self. Together, they lead to a maelstrom that makes people adopt neoliberal values as ideological imperative and requires them to meet these demands on their own authority and risk in terms of so-called self-government. The paper will refer to the efficient worker’s “technologies of the self” in conjunction with their medial- communicative acting and will discuss the question whether organizations/companies or policy makers should take over the responsibility for the economization of the efficient worker.

---

### **Maja Sonne Damkjær (Aarhus DK): ‘Studying the Impact of Mediatization Processes on Everyday Life through the Lens of Life Transitions’**

This paper argues that if we want to study the impact of mediatization processes on everyday life, it is fruitful to employ a ‘life transition’ perspective and merge the two competing traditions in current mediatization research, namely the ‘institutional tradition’ and the ‘cultural tradition’.

First, the paper discusses the impact of mediatization processes on everyday life. With the spread of online, interactive, and mobile technologies, media practices have become an inseparable part of everyday life and woven tightly into the fabric of our personal lives (Hepp & Krotz, 2014) and social institutions (Hjarvard, 2008). As media use becomes increasingly entangled and embedded in other practices such as work, leisure, and family practices, media usage in itself becomes ‘invisible’ (Livingstone, 2009) and taken for granted (Ling, 2012). This means that in order to study the mediatization of everyday life, researchers must embrace an interdisciplinary approach and employ theoretical and methodological perspectives that reinforce nuanced understandings of

the complex and multiple ways in which we engage in and make use of different media over the course of life.

This paper argues that studying and comparing the role of media specifically in *major life transitions*, such as, moving from home or becoming parents, is a productive perspective for mediatization research centered on everyday life. Social roles get redefined and patterns of communication evolve and transform as we move through life. Within and between life phases we (re)build and maintain our identity and relationships with media and through media. The life-transition perspective sheds light on the cross field between media-communicative practices and practices related to the transition from one social role to another. Consequently, this perspective unites two different ritual spaces: the everyday, practical, action-oriented sphere and the extraordinary, celebration rituals sphere related to the rite-of-passage. The intersection between the ordinary and the extraordinary, and between rituals as adjective and rituals as noun (Rothenbuhler, 1998), highlights the role of media in the complex interplay between social structures (macro-level), social institutions (meso-level), and individual actors (micro-level).

On this basis, the second part of the paper discusses the strengths and challenges in two competing approaches to mediatization research, namely the institutional perspective focusing on the role of media in the structural change of culture and society (Hjarvard 2008, 2013), and the cultural perspective centered on the relation between everyday media-communicative practices and socio-cultural change (Couldry & Hepp, 2013; Hepp 2013; Hepp & Krotz 2014). The institutional approach has a great explanatory force, whereas the cultural approach is remarkably context-sensitive. Hence, the paper argues that merging the two perspectives creates a connection between interaction, media, communicative practices, and institutional logics that in conjunction with a focus on life transitions contributes a new analytical perspective for studying the impact of mediatization processes on everyday life.

Lastly, the paper exemplifies how this particular life transition perspective has guided a study of mediatized parenthood in the first formative phase of family life.

### *References*

- Couldry, N., & Hepp, A. (2013). Conceptualizing mediatization: Contexts, traditions, arguments. *Communication Theory*, 23(3), 191-202.
- Hepp, A. (2013). *Cultures of mediatization*. Cambridge, UK; Malden, Ma: Polity.
- Hepp, A., & Krotz, F. (2014). Mediatized worlds - understanding everyday mediatization. In A. Hepp & F. Krotz (Eds.), *Mediatized worlds: Culture and society in a media age* (pp. 1-15). Basingstoke, Hampshire, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. .
- Hjarvard, S. (2008). The mediatization of society: A theory of the media as agents of social and cultural change. *NORDICOM Review*, 29(2), 105-134.
- Hjarvard, S. (2013). *The mediatization of culture and society*. New York: Routledge.
- Ling, R. S. (2012). *Taken for grantedness the embedding of mobile communication into society*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Livingstone, S. (2009). On the mediation of everything: ICA presidential address 2008. *Journal of Communication*, 59(1), 1-18.
- Rothenbuhler, E. W. (1998). *Ritual communication: From everyday conversation to mediated ceremony*. London: Sage.

---

### **Sander De Ridder (Ghent BE): 'The Mediatisation of Intimacy in Youth Cultures: Sexualities, Desires and Relationships as Digital Media Practices'**

Intimacy in the everyday lives of young people has undergone significant changes during the last two decades. Scholars have written about the transforming historical meanings

of intimacy and the way shifting notions of intimacy affect interpersonal relations, as well as how gender, sexuality and romance are currently understood. Examples of meta reflections are recent ideas on the democratization (Giddens, 1992; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, 1995; Weeks, 2007), and informalization (Wouters, 2007) of intimacy, while others have coined metaphors such as 'liquid love' (Bauman, 2003) and 'cold intimacies' (Illouz, 2007) to capture the specificities of intimacy in current culture.

This contribution will investigate the transformation of intimacy related to the increasing use of social media applications, such as social networking sites (SNSs), especially among young people. While SNSs are a specific popular medium in Western youth cultures, this paper will deal with broader media culture and illustrate how particular understandings of the media have the *power* to shape communicative interactions that, in turn, give meaning to intimacy (Hepp, 2012). Earlier work has linked transforming intimacies to the shift from interpersonal oral communication to use of digital media applications with specific technological structures and affordances (Schwarz, 2011). However, the specific role of *media culture* and people's *ideas about the media* are often overlooked. Therefore, this contribution serves as an illustration of the current mediatization of intimacy; how the social and cultural organization of intimacy is affected by an increasing media presence in the everyday lives of young people (Longhurst, 2007).

To that end, these insights draw broader upon a four-year research project (2010-2014) on youth, digital media culture and intimacy. The project used qualitative research methods to inquire young audiences' (14-18) media-related practices. Research methods include online participant observations, focus groups with young people, and interviews with actors in the social media industry; this variety of data will be used as illustration to the theoretical arguments.

The interest of this contribution is with the ethico-political consequences of the mediatization of intimacy among young social media audiences (Bakardjieva, 2010). As the meanings of intimacy vary historically, I want to question the role of contemporary digital media cultures in (re)producing or questioning heteronormative ideologies in youth cultures. I will conclude how contemporary digital media cultures have the power to stimulate a growth of knowledge, imagination and creativity to make sense of intimacy in youth cultures, while equally introducing new emerging regimes of control of particular sexual identities, desires and relationships.

## Paper session 5: *Critiques and Contestations*

---

### **Ines Braune (Marburg DE): 'From TV-Produced Documentaries about the Actors to Self-Produced Digital Videoclips from the Actors: Mediatized Cultural Practices of Parkour Contest Forms of Representation and Participation'**

Parkour a global mediatized cultural practice has witnessed since its beginning in the late 1980ies several transformation of media technology, which shapes the cultural practice of Parkour tremendously: from TV-produced documentaries about the actors to self-produced digital video-clips from the actors. This will be linked to processes of globalization as the historical developments are analyzed with an eye on North-South relations the meaning of which is in what way do different media technologies mould practices of representation and participation within the global Parkour community. This will be told from an actor-centered perspective of rather marginalized Parkour communities in the global South (Arab world).

I will shortly explain why I do speak about Parkour as a mediatized cultural practice. Media plays and has played a crucial role for the development of parkour at very different levels. In the late 1980ies when Parkour came in the suburbs of Paris into being; it consisted primarily of bodily practices in the urban area. Through movies and documentaries about and with the founding figures (David Belle and Sebastien Foucan) Parkour became internationally popular. Very often the initial encounter with parkour was through the movies and later through video clips, which Parkour actors (traceurs) had found on YouTube, rather coincidentally. Inspired by the moves the young guys began to translate the clips on the reality of their surroundings. After they had established a certain level of proficiency they made their own clips and posted them on YouTube. From there, these clips were responded to with comments from the international Parkour scene. Others tried to copy the moves, which they had seen in the Parkour clips in their local environment, etc.

Thinking about Parkour as both, street and online performance, parkour consists of a local moment, fundamentally concerned with the materiality of the street and simultaneously as a globally virtual discourse among millions of parkour actors.

Several aspects seem to be of special scientific interest: Parkour is not a single cultural product rather a set of cultural practices which combine online and offline activities. Against this background, processes of participation and representation are structured by conditions and architecture of online and offline surroundings at the same time. While some spaces of participation e.g. in the digital space have been breaking open others remained close due to e.g. restrictive European visa policies. This brings simplistic narratives of progress and linear developments clearly in question.

I approach this topic from a cultural studies perspective and it is based on anthropological field research in Morocco, Egypt, and online. Moreover it draws on qualitative interviews.

---

### **Tamara Witschge (Groningen NL) & Kaouthar Darmoni (Amsterdam NL): 'Counterpublics in the Age of Mediatization: Local Responses to Femen in Ukraine and the Arab World'**

In this paper we aim to provide an in-depth understanding of how mediatized, global forms of protest, in particular that of Femen, have limited impact when the messages are not embedded in local cultures. To understand the limitations of the mediatized activities of the feminist group Femen, we employ the concept of counterpublics next to

that of mediatisation. We argue that mediatisation of protest can hamper the dual function that counterpublic discourse and action has: On the one hand, counter publics form spaces for ‘withdrawal and regroupment,’ and on the other they ‘function as bases and training grounds for agitational activities directed toward wider publics’.<sup>1</sup> By heavily informing the media strategies of protest groups, mediatisation (in the form of adopting the forms of protest to dominant media logic) may lead to a foregrounding the *interpublic* discourse (gaining the attention of the general public) over the necessary *intrapublic* discourse (where common grounds are established). Through discourse analysis of the reception of Femen’s messages, we examine how the local embedment of global mediatised protest is necessary for its sustained impact beyond individual media activities. As such, we aim to contribute to the third theme of the conference: scrutinising the (lack of) lasting impact of mediatized protest on the local experiences of women subject to the mediatized activities of Femen.

Offering a unique comparison of different language communities this paper gauges the wider impact and particularly also the limitations of mediatization: The missing local connection in this case means a curbing of the emancipatory power of protest. Using antagonistic tactics to get messages across, and connecting to the global movement that Femen advocates to represent, otherwise local activities have reached dispersed audiences. However, the media attention they receive due to the smart and ludic media strategies employed does not reflect the way in which the message was received. Our analysis shows that because of Femen’s focus on the outward-focused, *interpublic* messages, which are heavily mediatised, the necessary *intrapublic* discourse has been back-burnered. Femen does not engage in a conversation with peers, the women who are subject to Femen’s protest. As such the wider community at the base of this endeavour is unable to develop a common agenda –the focus is rather on the arguments addressed ‘outward to society.’<sup>2</sup> This conversation with those in local contexts is very much needed, however, not in the least because of the geographical and cultural disparity of Femen’s activities and the women subject to these activities.

This case allows us to critique the process of mediatization by critically interrogating what is lost when forms of protest are highly informed by media logics. Employing recognizable activities and messages, the tactics of Femen are easily spread and recognizable, but due to the lack of connection to everyday lives in local contexts Femen activists are rather viewed as the ‘unrecognizable other’.<sup>3</sup> Moving beyond the analysis of the content of Femen’s media messages, we are able to show how women in Ukraine and the Arab world alike perceive the top-down media-oriented message as stereo-typing, orientalist, derogatory, vulgar and most importantly divorced from their everyday realities.

---

### **Marian T. Adolf (Zeppelin University DE): ‘The Epistemology of Mediatization’**

Mediatization has established itself as a concept to capture the increasingly important role of the media, media technologies and media offers for contemporary modern society. Due to its widespread resonance, mediatization has come to denote a variety of approaches and is anything but a neatly delimited concept. This has recently drawn a

---

<sup>1</sup> Fraser, Nancy. 1992. “Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy.” In *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, edited by C Calhoun, 109–142. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, p. 124.

<sup>2</sup> Asen, Robert. 2000. “Seeking the ‘Counter’ in Counterpublics.” *Communication Theory* 10 (4): 424– 446, p. 429.

<sup>3</sup> Reestorff, C. M. 2014. “Mediatised Affective Activism: The Activist Imaginary and the Topless Body in the Femen Movement.” *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies* 20 (4) (July 15): 478–495, p. 491.

number of criticisms, for example by political theorists Deacon and Stanyer (2014), who allege that mediatization may become a “concept of no difference” due to its theoretical and phenomenological breadth. Defending mediatization research against such apprehensions one might stress the concept’s inherent and necessary variability: its usefulness stems from its ability to denote a wide range of phenomena and to interweave formerly separate foci of social scientific research.

Still, a clarification of the conceptual scope might be required to productively address the existing variety and applications of the mediatization concept. There are at least two different current perspectives: an (i) action theoretical tradition that departs from the increase of available media channels and content, the growing importance of media in work and everyday life, as well as the expanding uses of media technology for the maintenance of social relations; and a (ii) second strand that derives from political communication and enquires into the formatting power of the media for other social fields and systems. Here, the media, by various mechanisms, influence other social spheres by virtue of a media logic or rationality that pervades the workings of organizations, institutions and society as a whole.

The proposed paper discusses the differences and commonalities of these typical approaches to mediatization research and takes a closer look at the central mechanisms they imply. Other possible classifications are discussed, and potential conceptual connections between the existing traditions are drawn. Trying to find middle ground between conceptualizing mediatization as an umbrella term for changing communicative practices on the micro-level, or casting it solely as a change in institutionalist rationalities, the culturalist tradition of communication research is invoked.

The crucial change process we are circumscribing by the concept of mediatization might not only lie with *what we know*, but *how we know*. Such a *media cultural* perspective takes into account the epistemological dimension of mediatization and connects the processes of media change and social change by revisiting the concept of knowledge.

### *References*

Deacon, David/Stanyer, James (2014): Mediatization: key concept or conceptual bandwagon? *Media, Culture & Society*. 8. August 2014 (Online First). doi: 10.1177/0163443714542218.

---

### **Sigrid Kannengießer (Bremen DE): ‘Questioning Mediatisation’**

Under the title „Questioning Mediatisation“ I will present results of a study, in which I analyse political initiatives, which are pointing out to the problems, which the mediatisation process produces - such as environmental pollution and human rights violations. When mediatisation is defined as a meta-process, in which media gain in importance in all societal areas and in which the media environment of individuals becomes more complex (Krotz 2007), the initiatives analysed question this process. They mainly question the quantitative aspect of mediatisation, which Hepp describes as an increase of media over time, regarding space, and in the social dimension (Hepp 2013, 52ff.). They here mainly question the increasing demand for media technologies and the effects, which their production and their disposal have for the environment and human beings. Next to criticizing these effects, the initiatives analysed in this study develop strategies to work against these problems, which are caused through the increasing demand for media technologies.

The focus of this presentation lies on Repair Cafés as case studies for the initiatives questioning mediatisation. In Repair Cafés, people meet to repair their everyday objects together. While some people bring their broken devices, others offer their help in the



repairing process voluntarily and without a charge. Invented in the Netherlands 2009, the concept of Repair Cafés has spread over many countries (especially in Western Europe).

For media and communication studies, the Repair Cafés are interesting in different aspects: First, media technologies are some of the goods, which are repaired in the Cafés; and as the study shows, they are the goods for which people seek most of the help regarding the repairing process. Second, in the Repair Cafés communities (in Max Weber's sense) are formed communicatively, as the people participating share a common aim and sense a feeling of belonging.

In the study presented, Repair Cafés have been analysed following these questions: Who are the people participating in Repair Cafés? Why and how do they participate? What do the Repair Cafés and the practice of repairing mean to the participants, especially repairing media technologies? And which societal relevance (especially regarding mediatization) do the participants see in the Repair Cafés? These questions have been analysed with a qualitative approach, combining observations and interviews.

The analysis shows that many people participate because they question the „more“ of media technologies by trying to avoid buying new ones, and instead try to repair their broken ones. With the repairing, they try to contribute to environmental protection and a sustainable society. But the analysis also shows that there is no homogeneous motivation for participation: Some people also participate to save money and use a service without charge. The presentation focuses on the motivations of the participants and elaborates the contradictions mentioned.

### *References*

Hepp, Andreas (2013): *Cultures of Mediatization*. Cambridge.

Krotz, Friedrich (2007): *Mediatization. Fallstudien zum Wandel von Kommunikation*. Wiesbaden.

---

### **Jonas Andersson Schwarz & Johan Hammarlund (Södertörn SE): ‘Social Media Bias, Flawed Remediation, and Imagined Populations’**

Based on key results from our recent quantitative study of data from social networking sites (SNSs) we will critically discuss some of the problematic cross-media phenomena arising at the intersection of conventional (majoritarian/centralized) mass media and (granular/interpersonal) social media.

We begin by noting two important dialectical insights on mediatization:

- When people criticize “social media,” what is criticized is actually rather often the (mass)mediatized image of these.
- In some instances the opposite tendency can be observed: Images of “the mass media” are mediatized through social media.

While we hold that the “social media logics” (van Dijck & Poell, 2013) of e.g. Twitter and Facebook are distinct from the established “mass media logics” of broadcasting (Altheide & Snow 1979; Hjarvard 2008), we argue that certain effects and processes are catalyzed when these two logics interact—sometimes in highly problematic ways.

We examine this through analyzing so-called retweeting (i.e. user-driven recirculation of posts made on Twitter). While Twitter remains a minority medium in Sweden, it holds an elite status in that this service seems to have great importance for the formation of public opinion. More specifically, we examine posts labeled *#svpol* and thus deemed part of “the political debate.”

There is a contemporary tendency for different stakeholders to refer to “social media” in general. Also news reporting in conventional mass media acts to remediate stories and scoops originated on SNSs. Our research contradicts the notion that such remediation would be in any way representative of a general population or for social media as a totality for that matter: Different excerpts from different social media entail different conditions, different venues, different incentives for users to participate, and ultimately different results.

We examined a topical debate and saw entirely different distributions of views expressed, depending on whether we looked at the Twitter arena where the public debate was thought to have originated; at the tabloid newspapers’ web surveys after the event; or at the public service television show *SVT Debatt*’s own Facebook page.

It is highly problematic that conventional mass media actors such as *SVT Debatt*, *Aftonbladet*, and *Expressen* appear to let “social media” serve as a representative of an imagined “general public” since the individual sweeps that the respective editorial boards make will inevitably be limited, biased, affected by “filter bubbles,” and extremely rarely representative of total populations. Further, the user activity that takes place within such social media “islands” is in fact often sparked by the editors themselves, as when *SVT Debatt* editors take responses to questions posted by the editors themselves on SVT’s own Facebook page and quote them in the live TV broadcast without notifying the individual sources beforehand.

Our findings suggest that despite best intentions among professional communicators, SNSs entail capricious settings for enumerating sets and/or quantities. While e.g. reporting might be intended to be neutral, when surveys and/or estimations are executed in an uncritical way, a categorical—even polarizing—logic arises. Our

intervention thus constitutes an intermedial comparison between different media forms but, first and foremost, an interdisciplinary critique.

---

### **Göran Bolin (Södertörn SE): 'Mediatized Memories in Intergenerational and Cross-Cultural Relations: The Analysis of Mediatization as a Long-Term Process'**

One of the criticisms that have been raised towards mediatization research is that although the concept of mediatization presupposes a long-term temporal perspective, there are few projects that methodologically have been studying the mediatized process over time (see, e.g. Deacon & Stanyer 2014). This paper argues that generational theory combined with life-course interviews and focus groups can be one suggested methodological solution to the problem of studying long-term social, cultural (and societal) change.

The paper will take its departure in an initial discussion on different time perspectives (themselves rooted in different theories of mediatization, as laid out by Bolin 2014): the institutional, the technological and the cultural. It will be argued that these three perspectives work with not only different perceptions of mediatization, but also with different temporal perspectives in terms of causalisation (where the institutional approach has a shorter historical perception than the cultural, for example, and hence a more focussed view on what are the 'effects' of the mediatization process).

Second, the paper will review generational as well as life-course theory, arguing that generational theory needs to more thoroughly take into consideration life-course and age dynamics. This also means combining both anthropological kinship models of generation (generation as kinship succession), and sociological models in the wake of Mannheim (generation as based in common, historically rooted experience).

Third, the paper will give accounts from a newly finished project on media generations in Sweden and Estonia, and based in both quantitative and qualitative data from this project discuss the possibility of overcoming the problem of doing research on mediatization as a long-term process. Through both inter-generational and cross-cultural analysis, the paper will show how media memories from childhood as well as from the formative years of youth can reveal specific traits in the historical process, and on how the role of the media have changed over time in the minds of different generations. The focus of the paper will be on four generations, having their formative years during significant historical moments in the late 20<sup>th</sup> and early 21<sup>st</sup> Century, marked by both significant nuances in the respective national media landscapes, but also in terms of the vast geo-political differences between the two countries. The discussion will end with some methodological conclusions on the merits of the life-course and focus group interview, critically evaluated against the motives of capturing mediatization processes over longer periods of time, and in different cultural and social contexts.

#### *References*

Bolin, Göran (2014): 'Institution, Technology, World: Relationships between the Media, Culture and Society', pp. 175-197 in Knut Lundby (ed.): *Mediatization of Communication*, Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Deacon, David & James Stanyer (2014): 'Mediatization: Key Concept or Conceptual Bandwagon?', *Media, Culture & Society*, Online First, pp. 1-13. DOI: 10.1177/0163443714542218.

---

**Stine Liv Johansen (Aarhus DK): 'Play with Media across Time and Space'**

This paper approaches children's use of digital media from an everyday life perspective, focusing on the role of playful media practices in and in between the different institutional settings of contemporary childhood.

Digital media has come to play an important and inevitable role in children's everyday life. Digital media such as tablets and smartphones form the technological infrastructure of children's daily practices of communication, education and play. research has a tendency to focus on the uses of new and old media in a formal, educational setting.

Only a few studies actually zoom in on children's and adolescents' everyday interactions, negotiations and practices with and around media, particularly in relation to different everyday activities, such as – in this case – iPad play and football as well as the social and cultural practices related thereto. Exceptions can be found, for instance, in Ito et al (2008) or Willett et al (2013). In this study, I aim at investigating the practices children perform in their peer relations, their families, and inside and outside schools and other kinds of adult-initiated settings. The knowledge that can be gained from this perspective holds potential for more formal settings as well through its focus on motivation, peer culture, and learning.

Furthermore, most research on children's uses of (new) media in an everyday life context focus on learning (Ito et.al (2008), Erstad et.al. (2013)). Only very few studies have leisure activities such as play as their primary focus (Willett et.al (2013), Marsh & Bishop (2012)) and also in pedagogical and educational practices, digital media are often linked to, if not legitimised by didactic purposes of different kinds. Children's own active meaning making processes are at the core of this paper's research interest, pointing to ways in which media of different sorts function as the symbolik and practices glue of everyday life.

For instance, media and mediated narratives and expressions fill an independent and comprehensive role as a kind of motor that keeps play going both at a general level across time and space and, quite specifically, in the play practices of a certain group of children in a certain context. As such, play with media can be said to function as a continuous movement back and forth between media's narratives, genres, and expressions and the play practice itself with or without different forms of media, computer games, mobile phones, tablets, the Internet, or toys.

---

**Abbas V. Kazemi & Hamed T. Kia (Tehran IR): 'Semi-Sacred and Profane Lifestyle: Iranian Multi Faces and the Internet'**

In this article, we analyze the new articulation of post-revolutionary Iranian middle classes' everyday life. This is new because the cyberspace has created a fresh trend for Iranian middle class to experience a new individuality that relates to the real life conflicts. After the Islamic revolution of 1979, the Islamic cultural policy struggled to "cleanse" the Western lifestyle, mostly establishing ideological institutions. These institutions are first ideologically Islamic and then officially rationalized. It means that they provoke the Islamic sacred ideal lifestyle that has led to three levels of cultural communication: administrative communication; street communication; and private communication. There is a cultural war in street between the Iranian middle class lifestyle and the administrative type of lifestyle. The cultural war is the consequence of consumer culture and globalization through the Internet and satellites. Therefore, these changes boosted a kind of modern individuality that relates to the social will toward a sense of Western lifestyle. In a sense, it is a culture war between sacred and profane. Thanks to the Internet, through the social networks like Facebook, Instagram and Viber,

Iranian middle class shares its special lifestyle through photos and texts. From this perspective, these social networks are the place of an online crowd. These cyber worlds are channels through the three levels of Iranian middle class's lifestyle. Consequently, the typical presence of middle class through texts and photos is a phenomenon emanated from the situation of this culture war. This has turned the sacred and the profane to the quasi-sacred and quasi-profane. They are not capable of removing each other and there is exhaustion between them. However, this conflict is the sign of vitality in Iranian middle classes' everyday life as a technique of self to construct its individuality. Thus, this vitality is empowered by the Internet. For this research, we have collected data by interview and also analyzed the texts and photos for content analysis.

## Participants

Marian T. Adolf (paper), Zeppelin U DE, marian.adolf@zu.de  
Jonas Andersson Schwarz (poster), Södertörn U SE, jonas.andersson.schwarz@sh.se,  
Stina Bengtsson (paper), Södertörn U SE, stina.bengtsson@sh.se  
Göran Blomqvist (RJ, introduction), Riksbankens Jubileumsfond SE, goran.blomqvist@rj.se  
Göran Bolin (ECREA, poster), Södertörn U SE, goran.bolin@sh.se  
Ines Braune (paper), Marburg U DE, ines.braune@uni-marburg.de  
Jørgen Bruhn (paper), Linné U SE, jorgen.bruhn@lnu.se  
Toivo Burlin (paper), Stockholm U SE, toivo.burlin@mups.su.se  
Maja Sonne Damkjær (paper), Aarhus U DK, imvmsd@dac.au.dk  
Kaouthar Darmoni (paper), Amsterdam U NL, K.Darmoni@uva.nl  
Sander De Ridder (paper), Ghent U BE, Sander.DeRidder@UGent.be  
Tina Ehn (RJ), Parliament SE, tina.ehn@mp.se  
Anders Ekström (paper), Uppsala U SE, anders.ekstrom@idehist.uu.se  
Mats Ekström (RJ, moderator), Göteborg U SE, mats.ekstrom@jmg.gu.se  
Mikkel Fugl Eskjær (paper), Aarhus U DK, eskjaer@hum.aau.dk  
Nicole Falkenhayner (paper), Freiburg U DE, nicole.falkenhayner@anglistik.uni-freiburg.de  
Karin Fast (RJ, moderator), Karlstad U SE, karin.fast@kau.se  
Johan Fornäs (RJ, introduction, moderator), Södertörn U SE, johan.fornas@sh.se  
Stig Hjarvard (ECREA, paper), Copenhagen U DK, stig@hum.ku.dk  
Anne-Kathrin Hoklas (paper), Berlin TU DE, anne-kathrin.hoklas@tu-berlin.de  
André Jansson (RJ, moderator), Karlstad U SE, andre.jansson@kau.se  
Anne Jerslev (RJ, moderator), Copenhagen U DK, jerslev@hum.ku.dk  
Stine Liv Johansen (poster), Aarhus U DK, stineliv@dac.au.dk  
Sigrid Kannengiesser (paper), Bremen U DE, sigrid.kannengiesser@uni-bremen.de  
Anne Kaun (RJ, moderator, conclusion), Södertörn U SE, anne.kaun@sh.se  
Abbas V. Kazemi (poster), Tehran U IR, AV3kazemi@gmail.com  
Emily Keightley (keynote, conclusion), Loughborough U UK, E.Keightley@lboro.ac.uk  
Ulrika Knutson (RJ), Journalist Uppsala SE, ulrika.knutson@telia.com  
Jukka Kortti (paper), Helsinki U FI, jukka.kortti@helsinki.fi  
Mads Krogh (paper), Aarhus U DK, musmk@dac.au.dk  
Friedrich Krotz (paper), Bremen U DE, krotz@uni-bremen.de  
Mikko Lehtonen (keynote), Tampere U FI, Mikko.S.Lehtonen@staff.uta.fi  
Steffen Lepa (paper), Berlin TU DE, steffen.lepa@tu-berlin.de  
Knut Lundby (paper, conclusion), Oslo U NO, knut.lundby@media.uio.no  
Morten Michelsen (paper), Copenhagen U DK, momich@hum.ku.dk  
Signe Opermann (paper), Södertörn U SE, signe.opermann@sh.se  
John Durham Peters (keynote), Iowa U US, john-peters@uiowa.edu  
Caroline Roth-Ebner (paper), Klagenfurt U AT, Caroline.Roth@aau.at  
Pelle Snickars (RJ, moderator), Umeå U SE, pelle.snickars@kb.se  
Ulrik Volgsten (paper), Örebro U SE, ulrik.volgsten@oru.se  
Maria Wikse (RJ), Riksbankens Jubileumsfond SE, maria.wikse@rj.se  
Tamara Witschge (paper), Groningen NL, t.a.c.witschge@rug.nl