

To Know Is to Compare

Studying Social Media
across Nations,
Media, and Platforms

Mora Matassi and
Pablo J. Boczkowski

To Know Is to Compare

To Know Is to Compare

Studying Social Media across Nations,
Media, and Platforms

Mora Matassi and Pablo J. Boczkowski

The MIT Press

Cambridge, Massachusetts | London, England

© 2023 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

This work is subject to a Creative Commons CC BY-NC-ND license.
Subject to such license, all rights are reserved.



The MIT Press would like to thank the anonymous peer reviewers who provided comments on drafts of this book. The generous work of academic experts is essential for establishing the authority and quality of our publications. We acknowledge with gratitude the contributions of these otherwise uncredited readers.

This book was set in Stone Serif and Stone Sans by Westchester Publishing Services.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Matassi, Mora, author. | Boczkowski, Pablo J., author.

Title: To know is to compare : studying social media across nations, media,
and platforms / Mora Matassi and Pablo J. Boczkowski.

Description: Cambridge, Massachusetts : The MIT Press, [2023]. |

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2022030583 (print) | LCCN 2022030584 (ebook) |

ISBN 9780262545938 (paperback) | ISBN 9780262374989 (epub) |

ISBN 9780262374972 (pdf)

Subjects: LCSH: Online social networks—Study and teaching. |

Social media—Study and teaching.

Classification: LCC HM742 .M365 2023 (print) | LCC HM742 (ebook) |

DDC 302.231—dc23/eng/20220707

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2022030583>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2022030584>

Contents

Acknowledgments vii

1 Nations, Media, and Platforms 1

I Foundations

2 Cross-National and Regional Comparisons 19

3 Cross-Media Comparisons 43

4 Cross-Platform Comparisons 63

II Pathways

5 Histories 87

6 Languages 113

**7 Blurred Genres, Trading Zones, and Heterogeneous
Inquiries 139**

Notes 159

References 165

Index 203

Acknowledgments

The story of this book is a play in two acts.

Act one took place in June 2018 during a meeting at the Luciano's gelateria branch near to the Google offices in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Among other topics, during that conversation we talked about our shared frustration with the relative lack of comparative perspectives in scholarship on social media. We thought that it could be worth exploring the possibility to develop a theoretical approach that would put comparative work at the center. Mora was about to start her doctorate at Northwestern University with Pablo as her advisor. For well over a year, we met weekly to discuss ideas and texts and ended up writing a manuscript that we submitted to a journal in fall 2019.

Act two occurred in April 2020 during a long WhatsApp chat discussing how to approach yet another round of revisions of the journal article. Mora had returned to Buenos Aires to spend what at the time seemed like just a few months of lockdown in the company of her family. As the conversation progressed, it became increasingly evident to both of us that the journal article format, with its strict word limit and genre expectations, was constraining our ability to both fully develop the various facets of our argument and do so in

ways that would show not only its theoretical import but also its social relevance. We ultimately realized that a book would provide a better canvas to lay out our vision, and so we wrote a proposal, secured a contract, and embarked in a year-long writing journey.

The writing process and our weekly calls about it became a life-line as the global shutdown continued far beyond what we had initially imagined and the pandemic's disruption reached far beyond the imaginable. The book in your hands is the result of an intellectual ride that helped us to hold onto something stable and to feel alive while many of the things we knew were losing stability and the level of loss was becoming staggering.

We were not alone during this creative and writing journey. Eugenia Mitchelstein, Ignacio Siles, Facundo Suenzo, and Celeste Wagner took the time to carefully comment on different versions of the book manuscript and provided us with bright and eye-opening perspectives. Larry Gross and anonymous reviewers contributed valuable feedback on earlier versions of some of the ideas further developed in this book and which were published in Matassi and Boczkowski (2021). Eszter Hargittai and Henry Jenkins, as well as David Park, Steve Jones, Santiago Marino, and anonymous journal article reviewers for *New Media & Society* offered helpful suggestions. Jack Bandy, Diego Gómez-Zara, Nicholas Hagar, Chelsea Peterson-Salahuddin, Daniel Trielli, and Erique Zhang provided important insights during a doctoral seminar on “Media Meet Technology” that Pablo taught at Northwestern University during the winter 2019 quarter, which Mora also took, and in which we first assessed the potential of the ideas that animate this book. Organizers and attendees at the Comparative Research in Media Studies Workshop, organized by Cicant—Lusófona University, University of Oslo, University of Bergen, and Católica Research Centre for Psychological, Family and Social Wellbeing, and in which Mora presented ideas contained in this book, asked us truly useful questions.

Working with MIT Press has been wonderful. Gita Manaktala, our editor, championed the project from day one, secured terrific reviews, gave us excellent insights, and was always available to answer any of our queries. At different stages in the project Erika Barrios and Suraiya Jetha provided excellent assistance. A book can unfortunately have only one home, but we also want to acknowledge the interest, support, and contributions of Mary Savigar at Polity Press. Finally, we want to thank the anonymous reviewers at MIT Press and Polity for their most useful feedback.

Pablo wholeheartedly thanks his friends and family for their support throughout the writing process during a most challenging time. As the saying goes, it takes a village, and he feels blessed for the one he inhabits. He is also deeply grateful to Mora for leading the writing process with unparalleled creativity, energy, commitment, and steadiness. Reaching middle age and a stage of career maturity has made him cherish the critical value of intellectual partnerships that make learning a lifelong process marked by a sense of excitement and discovery. Since this is the second time that he coauthors a book with a student while they are in graduate school—the first was with Eugenia Mitchelstein for *The News Gap* almost a decade ago, also published with MIT Press—he was aware from the start of this project of the unique intellectual energy that emerges when two very different generational outlooks coalesce. This generational encounter has marvelously shaped both what we say and how we chose to say it in this book, and he could not think of a better writing partner than Mora for this endeavor.

Mora is grateful to her family, friends, and colleagues for their inspiring presence in her life. She specially thanks her mentor and coauthor Pablo for opening up a world of opportunities and fostering each of them with care and generosity. Whenever the goals ahead seem too difficult, Pablo is there to offer an encouraging word and a clear path forward. During the process of writing this book,

he provided invaluable conditions for intellectual growth and kind collaboration—putting humanity always first. Mora also specially thanks her parents, Claudia and Víctor. They taught her the actual meaning of the words *confianza*, *apoyo*, *alegría*, y *amor*. Throughout all of her personal and professional projects, they have tirelessly supported her, amplifying what helping and nurturing a human being can mean. She will be forever grateful for the countless times in which they patiently, brightly, and eagerly listened, advised, and cared for her happiness, across Monte Grande, Buenos Aires, Boston, and Chicago, and across thousands of *mates*, *café*s, and meaningful conversations—offline and online. Mora’s intellectual journey simply wouldn’t exist if it weren’t for Claudia and Víctor’s time, infinite generosity, joy, and love. She dedicates this book to them.

Buenos Aires and Evanston, Illinois, April 29, 2022

1

Nations, Media, and Platforms

Introduction

For many of us it is no longer easy to remember how it was to live in a world without social media. How did we share our daily existence, find out what others were up to, get breaking news, watch DIY videos, play games, or even kill time before Facebook, WhatsApp, Instagram, WeChat, Twitter, YouTube, TikTok, Snapchat, and Twitch, among other platforms, became part of our vernacular? It is often hard to believe that only a few years ago our everyday communication practices were greatly different from what they are nowadays, to the extent that sometimes the early 2000s feel more like the mid-twentieth century than a decade ago in our rearview mirror.

The normalization of social media has also reached the field of communication and media studies. This domain of inquiry, which during the previous century was marked by a concern with broadcast and print media, has recently been almost obsessed with all things platforms. For instance, a keyword search conducted in summer 2021 for “television,” “newspapers,” and “radio” included in the titles of papers published in communication between 2012 and 2021 yielded 2,272, 1,242, and 923 results on the database Web of

Science, respectively, for a total of 4,437 entries. The same search using “social media” had 4,103 entries, almost as many as the previous three traditional media keywords combined. Furthermore, while the trend for television shows a slow decline in recent years, that for social media exhibits a steep upward trend that has widened the distance between the two: there were almost three times more publications with “social media” than with “television” in their titles during 2020 (616 vs. 214).

The burgeoning scholarship on social media has made fundamental contributions about a broad range of critical issues (boyd and Ellison 2007; boyd 2014; Baym 2015; Burgess, Marwick, and Poell 2018)—covering a wide array of topics such as identity making and self-presentation (Donath and boyd 2004; Marwick and boyd 2011), relationship maintenance and social capital (Ellison, Steinfield, and Lampe 2007; Quan-Haase and Young 2010), and political participation and activism (Tufekci and Wilson 2012; Jackson and Foucault Welles 2015). Importantly, a critical strand of social media studies has increasingly shed light on three key and interconnected aspects structuring the production, distribution, and use of platforms—namely, dynamics of racial and ethnic discrimination (Nakamura and Chow-White 2012; Gillespie 2018; Noble 2018; Brock 2020), the platform economy of social media (Gillespie 2010; Fuchs 2016; Plantin et al. 2018; Nielsen and Ganter 2022), and the logics of datafication and algorithmic bias (Bucher 2012; van Dijck 2014; Crawford and Gillespie 2016; Roberts 2019).

However, beneath the diversity of contributions from this scholarship there are three sets of common limitations that have characterized most social media research to date. First, the majority of studies has examined empirical phenomena taking place within the confines of a single country—and often located in the Global North. Second, the bulk of the research has focused on social media without connecting them to dynamics affecting other media and communication technologies, especially traditional or predigital alternatives. Third,

most scholarship has tended to concentrate on patterns related to a single platform at a time—usually either Facebook or Twitter. Taken together, these three limitations lead to a portrayal of the everyday realities of social media that is at best partial, and sometimes even distorted, relative to how platforms have been designed, distributed, and adopted. Let us briefly address each limitation separately.

First, platforms are deployed and used all over the world, with information flows connecting accounts located in multiple countries via reactions, comments, and shares. Single-country studies artificially cut this dense web of communication that does not necessarily stop at national borders—with some exceptions due most commonly to restrictions imposed by authoritarian regimes and/or inequalities in access. Furthermore, the Global North countries that have been the dominant foci of most scholarship collectively constitute only 14 percent of the planet's population. They also have distinguishing structural and cultural features that tend to be different from those that characterize the rest of the world.

Second, from the time of their development and throughout their meteoric rise to becoming a mainstay of contemporary communication practices, social media have entered a mediated communication landscape already featuring a rich array of artifacts and their associated cultures of production, circulation, and use. This broader landscape has shaped the brief but intense evolution of social media in at least two major ways. First, as a handful of studies has shown, prior communication technologies and genres—from the personal diaries of the nineteenth century to the reality television shows of the late twentieth century—have been precursors of what later became key aspects of the design and use of social media platforms (Marwick 2013; Hermida 2014; Humphreys 2018). Second, as platforms have become more popular, a significant portion of their use has been either concurrent with that of other media, for instance, in the increasingly common phenomenon of second screening (Doughty, Rowland, and Lawson 2012; Gil de Zúñiga, García-Perdomo, and

McGregor 2015; Gil de Zúñiga and Liu 2017), or in relation to content originally produced by other media such as social media activity around news stories, television shows, and movies (Highfield, Harrington, and Bruns 2013; Ksiazek, Peer, and Lessard 2016; Gutiérrez-Martín and Torrego-González 2018). Thus, a focus on social media that isolates them from the broader media and communication landscape effectively removes historical and contemporary connections that have variously shaped the everyday life of platforms.

Third, despite the single-platform focus of most scholarship, social media use is remarkably plural. To begin, according to DataReportal, “the typical user actively uses or visits an average of 7.5 different social media platforms each month.”¹ Moreover, mounting scholarly evidence suggests that people use a particular platform in relation to how they use the others they routinely access (Boczkowski, Matassi, and Mitchelstein 2018; Tandoc Jr., Lou, and Min 2019). In addition, contrary to the overwhelming attention paid to Facebook and Twitter in the existent academic literature, there are dozens of other platforms that have garnered the interest of users. As of 2022, there are thirty platforms with at least 100 million users each, and while Facebook occupies the first place in this list with 2.9 billion monthly active users, Twitter is in the seventeenth place with less than 400 million.² The combination of a single-platform focus that is at odds with the greater plurality of the user experience, and a concentration on Facebook and Twitter in a field that includes a much wider array of alternatives about which we know comparatively much less, has unnecessarily diminished our accounts of the role of social media in the experiences of billions of people around the world.

Beneath these three sets of limitations lies a common denominator characterized by the absence of comparative analyses across nations and regions, across media, and across platforms. Thus, in this book we aim to contribute to scholarship on social media by developing original comparative perspectives that intend to overcome these

limitations. Our contribution builds on studies that have already shown the value of comparing social media phenomena on at least one of the three dimensions highlighted above—across nations and regions, media, and platforms. But, unlike most of these studies, in which comparative work seems to have emerged as a by-product of trying to answer specific research questions, we propose to turn the practice of comparison into the epistemological principle framing our intellectual agenda. In this sense, our proposal is premised on the idea that foregrounding systematic comparative efforts across nations, media, and platforms holds great potential for social media scholarship.

Pursuing this intellectual agenda entails a stance which signals that at a very basic level—as the title of this book encapsulates—to know is to compare. Simply put, by this we mean that whatever it is that we are able to know, we do so as a result of contrasting two or more entities. We view this comparative stance as related to, but distinct from, issues of method and theory. On the one hand, its enactment can be undertaken utilizing a variety of methods, as we will illustrate with specific examples throughout the book. On the other hand, the answers to the questions animated by this stance are amenable to explanation by a range of theoretical frameworks, as we will also show in future chapters. In this sense, the core of our intellectual agenda is a broader epistemological umbrella that encompasses issues of methods (how to gather and analyze data) and theory (how to explain variance in the findings), which leads to a refiguration of, paraphrasing Clifford Geertz, “what is it that we want to know” (1980, 178).

As James R. Beniger argued three decades ago, “*all* social science research is comparative” (1992, 35; emphasis in the original). Comparative scholarship has a long history in communication and media studies, where it has been appreciated for different reasons: its capacity to attain generalizations from past periods and singular

contexts, its power to test hypotheses, its ability to properly contextualize and thus avoid the naturalization of specific cases, and its promotion of international academic collaborations, among others (Esser and Hanitzsch 2012). Within communication and media studies, comparative research has been enacted in a variety of ways. The novelty of our proposal stems partly from foregrounding the role of comparisons coupled with the impetus, continuing with the landmark essay by Clifford Geertz (1980), to “blur genres” of comparative research in the service of accounts of social media phenomena that reflect their global, de-westernized, inter-media, and multiplatform existence. Thus, in the next section we continue our argumentative journey by elaborating on how different varieties of comparative research have informed this book.

Varieties of Comparative Research

Our analyses of cross-national and regional dynamics are indebted to a long tradition of scholarship in communication and media studies that has used almost interchangeably the terms *comparative* and *international* to describe research projects that “contrast among different macro-level units, such as world regions, countries, sub-national regions, social milieus, language areas and cultural thickenings, at one point or more points in time” (Esser and Vliegenthart 2017, 2). The field has engaged intercultural communication perspectives since the 1950s and cross-national approaches since the 1970s, driven by an interest in cross-cultural and political communication topics (Blumler and Gurevitch 1975; Hall 1976; Hofstede 1983; Blumler, McLeod, and Rosengren 1992; Hallin and Mancini 2004; Norris 2009).³

Cross-national and regional scholarship in communication and media studies has been fueled by at least two interconnected insights, both emphasizing the limitations involved in single-country

approaches. The first insight is the centrality of media and communication in processes of globalization (Livingstone 2012). This sparked, on the one hand, an interest in the question of cooperation across diverse national settings, as illustrated by work in inter-cultural communication (Kim 2012), and, on the other, efforts against “methodological nationalism” (Beck 2000) aiming to display a global outlook. As Sonia Livingstone argued (2012), cross-national studies showed that “it is no longer plausible to study one phenomenon in one country without asking, at a minimum, whether it is common across the globe or distinctive to that country or part of the world” (417). The second insight has been the field’s recognition of a parochial and universalizing Western bias whereby “the same few countries keep recurring as if they are a stand-in for the rest of the world” (Curran and Park 2000, 2). This bias has been paired up with an uncritical uptake of cultural globalization (Curran and Park 2000; Morris and Waisbord 2001; Kraidy 2009), which has often ended up erasing the place of the state. The cross-national and regional variety of comparative research thus denaturalizes the single-country strategy and prevents, at least a priori, any nation or region to acquire a default status.

Different typologies have been put forward to assist in the process of cross-national and regional comparisons. A prominent one was developed by Geert Hofstede, who contended that “the comparison of cultures presupposes that there is something to be compared; that each culture is not so unique that any parallel with another culture is meaningless” (1984, 32). He proposed the existence of four dimensions according to which all cultures could be compared: individualism versus collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, power distance, and masculinity versus femininity (Hofstede 1983). In another highly influential cross-national approach, Daniel C. Hallin and Paolo Mancini (2004) put forward a different typology that sought to correlate nations with media systems. Analyzing eighteen Western democracies, they came up with the “Mediterranean or Polarized Pluralist, North/Central European or Democratic Corporatist, and the North

Atlantic or Liberal models” (2004, 2). This account opened the door for a series of studies that made visible a variety of media systems around the world (Sparks 2008; Brüggemann et al. 2014; Guerrero and Márquez-Ramírez 2014). In the authors’ words: “As Bendix (1963: 537) says, comparative analysis has the capacity to “increase the ‘visibility’ of one structure by contrasting it with another.” Analysts deeply steeped in one media system will often miss important characteristics of their own system, characteristics that are too familiar to stand out to them against the background. . . . Comparative analysis is essential if we want to move beyond these limitations” (Hallin and Mancini 2004, 302).

In addition to these cross-national and regional varieties of comparative research, our cross-media work has been informed by scholarship produced between the end of the twentieth century and the start of the twenty-first century aiming to conceptualize what might be distinct about what was then often referred to as “new media” (Williams, Rice, and Rogers 1988; Rice 1999; Manovich 2002; Chun, Fisher, and Keenan 2004). A recurrent theme across the different perspectives adopted to address this matter, and the resulting answers about their distinct character, was the centrality of the connections between the then new media and their older predecessors. Thus, in their influential treatise of how new media always remediate, Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin argued that “what is new about new media comes from the particular ways in which they refashion older media and the ways in which older media refashion themselves to answer the challenges of new media” (1999, 15).

Maintaining a cultural focus on aesthetics while adding accounts of industries and audiences, Henry Jenkins drew inspiration from the pioneering assertion of Ithiel de Sola Pool that a “convergence of modes [was] blurring the lines between media” (de Sola Pool 1983, 23) to highlight the centrality of this convergence as a defining feature of the new media that entailed “the flow of content across multiple media platforms, the cooperation between multiple media

industries, and the migratory behavior of media audiences who will go almost anywhere in search of the kinds of entertainment experiences they want” (Jenkins 2006, 2). Furthermore, combining social and behavioral science approaches, Leah Lievrouw and Sonia Livingstone (2002, 8) emphasized in their introduction to the first edition of *The Handbook of New Media* “the essentially continuous nature of new media development. Even technologies that are perceived as being unprecedented are found upon closer analysis to have been designed, built and implemented around existing technologies and practices.” Thus, capturing the spirit of these and other related ideas, David Thorburn and Henry Jenkins (2003) criticized what they called “medium-specific approaches” and made a strong plea for a “comparative approach”: “Medium-specific approaches risk simplifying technological change to a zero-sum game in which one medium gains at the expense of its rivals. A less reductive, *comparative approach* would recognize the complex synergies that always prevail among media systems, particularly during periods shaped by the birth of a new medium of expression” (3; emphasis added).

These conceptual developments relate to another trend in scholarship that blossomed during this period and that has also informed our cross-media comparative perspective: historical accounts of specific innovations in media, information, and communication technologies that inquired into dynamics of both continuity and discontinuity with previous artifacts (Boczkowski 2004; Fischer 1992; Sterne 2003; Thompson 2002; Turner 2006). In *When Old Technologies Were New*, Carolyn Marvin (1988) articulated the historiographic foundation of this kind of scholarship as follows: “New media, broadly understood to include the use of new communications technology for old or new purposes, new ways of using old technologies, and, in principle, all other possibilities for the exchange of social meaning, are always introduced into a pattern of tension created by the coexistence of old and new, which is far richer than any single medium that becomes a focus of interest because it is novel” (8).

This coexistence of old and new within broader and ongoing social, cultural, and institutional patterns became a generative lens with which to probe specific issues about distinct technological innovations. One example of particular significance to social media is Susan Douglas's (1989) account of the role of amateurs in the early development of radio. Much like the case of contemporary platforms such as Facebook, built largely by technically savvy innovators initially outside of the corporate landscape and premised upon notions of an active user base, Douglas sheds light on the key role that amateurs played in switching radio from telegraphy into a broadcasting model. Their participation amounted to "a revolutionary social phenomenon. . . . A large radio audience was taking shape whose attitude and involvement were unlike those of other, traditionally passive, audiences. . . . This was an active, committed, and participatory audience" (205). Thus, in the span of a few years, "the amateurs and their converts had constructed the beginnings of a broadcasting network and audience" (302).

Shifting from radio to print, Adrian Johns's (1998) analysis of the social relationships and conventions that undergirded the credibility of knowledge in the early days of book publishing has an uncanny significance for digital media—including platforms—especially considering issues of distrust about them. To Johns, the "political and moral economies of publishing and reading are enormously different now from their state in Newton's day. Nevertheless, a close examination will almost certainly reveal not an elimination . . . but a transformation of the kinds of sociability and civility involved" (1998, 636). For instance, he notes that "Financial institutions and other corporations are laboring to establish a means of rendering electronic communication secure enough to supplant more traditional media. It is not too fanciful to *compare* these efforts to the Royal Society's endeavors to secure the credit of printed communications in the seventeenth century" (Johns 1998, 637; emphasis added).

Supplementing these cross-national and cross-media approaches, our cross-platform work has been informed by a series of theoretical developments that since the 1980s have tried to explain how users make sense of an increasingly diversified media environment. Central to this development was the growing multiplicity of channels available on cable television, which sparked questions around issues of choice and awareness of alternatives (Webster and Wakshlag 1983; Perse 1990). Scholars articulated the notion of repertoires to address this multiplicity (Ferguson 1992; Ferguson and Perse 1993). First defined by Carrie Heeter (1985) in relation to “the set of channels watched regularly by an individual or household” (133), the notion reflected the idea that users were drawn to a relatively smaller set of options from which they made consumption decisions. The “high-choice media environment” (Prior 2005) became manageable in everyday life through the construction of media repertoires (Webster 2011). The concept has been recently applied to newer media, with studies (Kim 2016; Lin 2019) showing how repertoires are “essentially structures that are recursively activated within their daily social practices” (Taneja et al. 2012, 964).

Another influential approach developed to analyze how users deal with an ever-expanding array of media alternatives is the notion of polymedia (Madianou and Miller 2013; Renninger 2015; Madianou 2016). Initially applied to account for family communication dynamics that take place within the context of transnational migration processes, Mirca Madianou and Daniel Miller (2012) coined the term to describe “a new communication environment” (1) in which different options coexist—among them, social media—and whose use shapes, and is shaped by, family relationships. In the authors’ words: “Polymedia shifts the attention from the individual technical propensities of any particular medium to an acknowledgement that most people use a constellation of different media as an integrated environment in which each medium finds its niche in relation to the others” (Madianou and Miller 2012, 3).

The notion of constellations, mentioned by Madianou and Miller, is also key to understanding how social media repertoires are enacted in everyday life. Pablo Boczkowski, Mora Matassi, and Eugenia Mitchellstein (2018) show how the constellation of meanings that users attribute to different social media platforms shapes their repertoires of practices. These meanings are relational since the meaning attributed to a given platform is partly determined by the meanings attributed to the other platforms that constitute the social media repertoire. The creation of users' "social media ecosystems" (Zhao, Lampe, and Ellison 2016; DeVito, Walker, and Birnholtz 2018) also illustrates the extent to which platforms are deeply situated within a dense and broad web of social media use in everyday life and can be associated with the longer tradition of media ecology (Innis 1964; McLuhan [1964] 2003; Ong 1982; Postman 1986; Lehman-Wilzig and Cohen-Avigdor 2004; Strate 2004; Scolari 2013) and its double approach to consider both how media can be "an environment that surrounds the subjects and models their cognitive and perceptual system" and "the interactions between media, as if they were species of an ecosystem" (Scolari 2012, 209–210).

In sum, the varieties of comparative scholarship that we have included in this section differ empirically, methodologically, and theoretically. Yet, there is a common denominator that cuts across this diversity: the centrality of comparing as the key epistemic operation that guides the inquiry. Thus, in this book we will blur the boundaries between these varieties—albeit without erasing their differences—to develop multifaceted comparative perspectives that can contribute toward de-westernized, global, cross-media, and multiplatform scholarship on social media.

Outline of the Book

The remainder of this book consists of two multichapter parts and a concluding chapter. Each one of chapters 2 through 6 opens with

contrasting vignettes that illustrate the most salient aspects of each chapter's topics with highly visible events that unfolded within—and in many cases also across—several different parts of the world. Taken together, these vignettes that range from the mundane to the extraordinary, and from the relatively insignificant to the highly consequential, show some of the main ways in which social media have been appropriated in almost every sphere of everyday life, from activism to entertainment, from religion to politics, from news to gaming, and from design to regulation, among others. The decision to start these chapters in this fashion is both to signal the reticular and multifaceted imbrication of social media in contemporary society and to underscore the pragmatic currency of our comparative perspectives.

In *Foundations*, the first part, we will establish the empirical, methodological, and theoretical bases that emerge from an account of the existent scholarship on social media that has compared phenomena either across nations and regions, media, or platforms. More precisely, chapter 2 will focus on cross-national and regional comparisons, chapter 3 on cross-media accounts, and chapter 4 on cross-platform examinations. In each of these chapters we will introduce a selection of eight studies to show the descriptive, explanatory, and interpretive gains that accrue from adopting at least one of these three forms of comparison, even if (as has usually been the case) this has not been done as part of an explicit comparative research agenda. Thus, we will argue that a comprehensive account of this scholarship creates the foundations on which to build an agenda for comparative social media studies.

The selected twenty-four papers that we will showcase in chapters 2 to 4 aim to maximize breadth and depth in the portrayal of the existent research. In that sense, our goal is not to furnish a representative or exhaustive depiction of the field. In other words, the following pages will not present the results of meta-analyses or systematic reviews. Instead, we chose to feature studies that examined relevant social media processes in a wide array of countries and regions of

the world, connecting different traditional and social media, and a multiplicity of platforms. This is a deliberate strategy to decenter a domain of inquiry that, as explained earlier, has tended to intellectually prioritize locations in Global North settings, traditional media such as newspapers and television, and platforms such as Facebook and Twitter. While helpful in the production of certain kinds of knowledge, taken together these location, media, and platform choices have unnecessarily restricted what we know about objects of study that have global reach, connect variously to a plethora of traditional media, and are embodied in a growing spectrum of platforms.

In each of the chapters we will organize the presentation of the selected research studies into four categories of analysis that allude to key elements of the research enterprise: topics, the main issues examined in each of the papers; approaches, the dominant ways of comparing social media, either implicitly or explicitly; methods, the main methodological strategies utilized; and interpretations, the typical frames used to make sense of the findings and their implications.

Establishing these empirical, methodological, and theoretical foundations enables us to probe three central concepts for understanding social media: the nation-state, traditional media, and platforms. Thus, in chapter 2 we will argue that whereas much research and commentary has highlighted the decline of national borders regarding digital dynamics in a context of globalization, it is still worth attending to the heuristic power of the nation-state. However, its explanatory role can no longer be taken for granted within the scholarly inquiry and instead should be justified as part of the process of this inquiry. Moreover, in chapter 3 we will contend that despite the typical focus on what is new about social media, our comparative perspective emphasizes the continued relevance of their traditional media counterparts in both determining the genealogy of whatever novelty there is and the coexistence of this novelty with long-standing patterns of communication artifacts, practices, and norms. Finally, in chapter 4 we

will claim that cross-platform perspectives are better suited than their single-platform counterparts to counter dystopic narratives that have recently dominated accounts of social media. This is because whereas the latter are more prone to attributing strong deterministic power to technology over the agency of users, the former create more opportunities for the emergence of variance in the findings which, in turn, make more visible the interplay between the structure of technology and the agency of users.

In *Pathways*, the second part, we will build on the bases established in *Foundations* to further articulate the contours of a programmatic agenda integrating cross-national and regional, cross-media and cross-platform dimensions of social media dynamics. We will do this by focusing on two areas of inquiry that have long been central to the study of media and communication, and to the constitution of our sense of self and social relationships more broadly: histories in chapter 5 and languages in chapter 6. Aware that prior social media scholarship has on occasion delved into either area, in each of these chapters we will first acknowledge lessons learned from these antecedents and then proceed to articulate concrete epistemic visions for comparative perspectives.

Following up on the larger conceptual issues tackled in the chapters within the first part, those in the second part will address two cross-cutting intellectual tendencies that have marked the study of social media. More precisely, chapter 5 will probe the role of histories to offset the overwhelming present-day focus that has tended to dismiss the past and naturalize the present in the relevant literature. We will argue that foregrounding historical matters can help illuminate continuities and discontinuities that are fundamental to a better understanding of what might be unique about specific platforms and social media in general. This applies to both their development and their current instantiations. Furthermore, chapter 6 will address matters of language to broaden the dominant attention to English and writing in most of the scholarship. To this end, we

will articulate approaches that challenge these English-language and written-text biases through an exploration of dynamics pertaining to multiple languages and to the role of the novel visual signifiers such as emoji, hashtags, and reaction buttons that have rapidly become part of the vernacular of social media and digital culture more generally. We will contend that this aids not only in bringing new languages and signifiers into view—languages and signifiers which are the norm and not the exception in everyday social media practice—but also in properly accounting for factors that might affect variance in the case of communication only in English and/or textual form.

In chapter 7 we will bring this book to a close by taking stock of lessons learned from the previous chapters and reflecting on their broader implications for scholarship on social media. A review of the main arguments presented in chapters 2 through 6 suggests the presence of a significant level of heterogeneity cutting across social media as both objects of study and the ways in which the inquiries about them have unfolded. Building upon the notion of the heterogeneity of social media, we will probe the challenges and potential of fostering comparative work that integrates two or more of the dimensions treated separately in the previous chapters: comparisons across nations and regions, across media, and across platforms. We will argue that the challenges that might hinder the potential of these various integrations stem from long-standing trends toward the intellectual fragmentation of the different traditions of inquiry that subtend the comparative analyses undertaken in each dimension. However, we will propose that by virtue of sharing the organizing principle that to know is to compare, the perspectives advocated in this book can blur boundaries between disparate traditions of inquiry and also create trading zones (Galison 1997) among them. These trading zones can lessen the downsides of intellectual fragmentation by facilitating the exchange of ideas across often unconnected domains of inquiry in ways that do not flatten their diversity.

References

- Abdenour, Jesse. 2017. Digital gumshoes: Investigative journalists' use of social media in television news reporting. *Digital Journalism* 5 (4): 472–492. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2016.1175312>.
- Abokhodair, Norah, and Adam Hodges. 2019. Toward a transnational model of social media privacy: How young Saudi transnationals do privacy on Facebook. *New Media & Society* 21 (5): 1105–1120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818821363>.
- Alencar, Amanda. 2018. Refugee integration and social media: A local and experiential perspective. *Information, Communication & Society* 21 (11): 1588–1603. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2017.1340500>.
- Alonso, Andoni, and Pedro Oiarzabal, eds. 2010. *Diasporas in the New Media Age: Identity, Politics, and Community*. Reno: University of Nevada Press.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1983. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso Books.
- Anderson, Benedict. 1994. Exodus. *Critical Inquiry* 20 (2): 314–327. <https://doi.org/10.1086/448713>.
- Anduiza, Eva, Camilo Cristancho, and José M. Sabucedo. 2014. Mobilization through online social networks: The political protest of the *indignados* in Spain. *Information, Communication & Society* 17 (6): 750–764. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2013.808360>.
- Appadurai, Arjun. 1990. Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. *Theory, Culture & Society* 7 (2–3): 295–310. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026327690007002017>.

- Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Arriagada, Arturo, and Francisco Ibáñez. 2020. "You need at least one picture daily, if not, you're dead": Content creators and platform evolution in the social media ecology. *Social Media + Society* 6 (3): 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120944624>.
- Arthurs, Jane, Sophia Drakopoulou, and Alessandro Gandini. 2018. Researching YouTube. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies* 24 (1): 3–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354856517737222>.
- Averbeck, Stefanie. 2008. Comparative history of communication studies: France and Germany. *The Open Communication Journal* 2 (1): 1–13.
- Avital, Moran. 2021. "Days of mourning are days of reconciliation": An analysis of the coverage of the death of controversial Israeli public figures. *Journalism* 22 (7): 1739–1756. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884918824234>.
- Bakshy, Eytan, Solomon Messing, and Lada A. Adamic. 2015. Exposure to ideologically diverse news and opinion on Facebook. *Science* (6239): 1130–1132. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa1160>.
- Barnard, Stephen R. 2016. "Tweet or be sacked": Twitter and the new elements of journalistic practice. *Journalism* 17 (2): 190–207. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884914553079>.
- Barton, David, and Carmen Lee. 2013. *Language Online: Investigating Digital Texts and Practices*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Bastos, Marco Toledo, Cornelius Puschmann, and Rodrigo Travitzki. 2013. Tweeting across hashtags: Overlapping users and the importance of language, topics, and politics. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM Conference on Hypertext and Social Media*, 164–168. New York: Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2481492.2481510>.
- Bayer, Joseph B., Nicole B. Ellison, Sarita Y. Schoenebeck, and Emily B. Falk. 2016. Sharing the Small moments: Ephemeral social interaction on Snapchat. *Information, Communication & Society* 19 (7): 956–977. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1084349>.
- Baym, Nancy K. 2015. *Personal Connections in the Digital Age*. Malden, MA: Polity.
- Beck, Ulrich. 2000. *What Is Globalization?* Cambridge: Polity.
- Beniger, James R. 1992. Comparison, yes, but—the case of technological and cultural change. In *Comparatively Speaking: Communication and Culture Across Space and Time*, edited by Jay G. Blumler, Jack McLeod, and Karl E. Rosengren, 35–50. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.

- Benjamin, Walter. (1936) 1969. The work of art in the age of mechanical reproduction. In *Illuminations*, edited by Hannah Arendt, 217–251. New York: Schocken.
- Benkler, Yochai, Rob Faris, and Hal Roberts. 2018. *Network Propaganda: Manipulation, Disinformation, and Radicalization in American Politics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bennett, W. Lance. 2012. The personalization of politics: Political identity, social media, and changing patterns of participation. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 644 (1): 20–39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716212451428>.
- Bennett, W. Lance, and Alexandra Segerberg. 2012. The Logic of connective action: Digital media and the personalization of contentious politics. *Information, Communication & Society* 15 (5): 739–768. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2012.670661>.
- Benoit, William L., Mark J. Glantz, Anji L. Phillips, Leslie A. Rill, Corey B. Davis, Jayne R. Henson, and Leigh Anne Sudbrock. 2011. Staying “on message”: Consistency in content of presidential primary campaign messages across media. *American Behavioral Scientist* 55 (4): 457–468. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764211398072>.
- Benzecry, Claudio E., and Daniel Winchester. 2017. Varieties of microsociology. In *Social Theory Now*, edited by Claudio E. Benzecry, Monika Krause, and Isaac Reed, 42–74. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Berger, Charles R. 1991. Communication theories and other curios. *Communication Monographs* 58 (1): 101–113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03637759109376216>.
- Bhugra, Dinesh. 1993. Cross-cultural aspects of jealousy. *International Review of Psychiatry* 5 (2–3): 271–280. <https://doi.org/10.3109/09540269309028317>.
- Bijker, Wiebe. 1995. *Of Bicycles, Bakelites, and Bulbs: Toward a Theory of Sociotechnical Change*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bijker, Wiebe E., Thomas P. Hughes, and Trevor Pinch. 1987. *The Social Construction of Technological Systems: New Directions in the Sociology and History of Technology*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Billig, Michael. 1995. *Banal Nationalism*. London: SAGE.
- Bimber, Bruce. 2014. Digital media in the Obama campaigns of 2008 and 2012: Adaptation to the personalized political communication environment. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics* 11 (2): 130–150. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19331681.2014.895691>.
- Blumer, Herbert. 1969. *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Blumler, Jay L., and Michael Gurevitch. 1975. Towards a comparative framework for political communication research. In *Political Communication: Issues and Strategies for Research*, edited by Steven H. Chaffee, 165–193. Beverly Hills, CA: SAGE.

Blumler, Jay G., Jack McLeod, and Karl E. Rosengren, eds. 1992. *Comparatively Speaking: Communication and Culture Across Space and Time*. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE.

Boczkowski, Pablo J. 2004. *Digitizing the News: Innovation in Online Newspapers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Boczkowski, Pablo J. 2021. *Abundance: On the Experience of Living in a World of Information Plenty*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Boczkowski, Pablo J., and Leah A. Lievrouw. 2008. Bridging STS and communication studies: Research on media and information technologies. In *The Handbook of Science and Technology Studies*, edited by Edward J. Hackett, Olga Amsterdamska, Michael E. Lynch, Judy Wajcman, Sergio Sismondo, Wiebe E. Bijker, Stephen Turner, et al., 949–977. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Boczkowski, Pablo J., Mora Matassi, and Eugenia Mitchelstein. 2018. How young users deal with multiple platforms: The role of meaning-making in social media repertoires. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 23 (5): 245–259. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmy012>.

Boczkowski, Pablo, and Eugenia Mitchelstein. 2021. *The Digital Environment: How We Live, Learn, Work, and Play Now*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Boczkowski, Pablo J., Eugenia Mitchelstein, and Martin Walter. 2011. Convergence across divergence: Understanding the gap in the online news choices of journalists and consumers in Western Europe and Latin America. *Communication Research* 38 (3): 376–396. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650210384989>.

Bode, Leticia. 2016. Pruning the news feed: Unfriending and unfollowing political content on social media. *Research & Politics* 3 (3): 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053168016661873>.

Bode, Leticia, and Emily K. Vraga. 2018. Studying politics across media. *Political Communication* 35 (1): 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2017.1334730>.

Bogers, Loes, Sabine Niederer, Federica Bardelli, and Carlo De Gaetano. 2020. Confronting bias in the online representation of pregnancy. *Convergence* 26 (5–6): 1037–1059. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354856520938606>.

Bolter, J. David, and Richard A. Grusin. 1999. *Remediation: Understanding New Media*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bondes, Maria, and Günter Schucher. 2014. Derailed emotions: The transformation of claims and targets during the Wenzhou online incident. *Information, Communication & Society* 17 (1): 45–65. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2013.853819>.

- Bosch, Tanja Estella, Mare Admire, and Meli Ncube. 2020. Facebook and politics in Africa: Zimbabwe and Kenya. *Media, Culture & Society* 42 (3): 349–364. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443719895194>.
- Bou-Franch, Patricia, and Pilar Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, eds. 2019. *Analyzing Digital Discourse: New Insights and Future Directions*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Boulianne, Shelley. 2015. Social media use and participation: A meta-analysis of current research. *Information, Communication & Society* 18 (5): 524–538. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1008542>.
- Boulianne, Shelley. 2020. Twenty years of digital media effects on civic and political participation. *Communication Research* 47 (7): 947–966. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650218808186>.
- Bourdon, Jérôme. 2018. The case for the technological comparison in communication history. *Communication Theory* 28 (1): 89–109. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ct/qtqx001>.
- Bouvier, Gwen. 2019. How journalists source trending social media feeds: A critical discourse perspective on Twitter. *Journalism Studies* 20 (2): 212–231. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2017.1365618>.
- boyd, danah. 2014. *It's Complicated: The Social Lives of Networked Teens*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- boyd, danah, and Kate Crawford. 2012. Critical questions for big data: Provocations for a cultural, technological, and scholarly phenomenon. *Information, Communication & Society* 15 (5): 662–679. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2012.678878>.
- boyd, danah, and Nicole B. Ellison. 2007. Social network sites: Definition, history and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 13 (1): 210–230. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00393.x>.
- Bozdag, Cigdem. 2020. Managing diverse online networks in the context of polarization: Understanding how we grow apart on and through social media. *Social Media + Society* 6 (4): 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120975713>.
- Bozdag, Cigdem, and Kevin Smets. 2017. Understanding the images of Alan Kurdi with “small data”: A qualitative, comparative analysis of tweets about refugees in Turkey and Flanders (Belgium). *International Journal of Communication* 11:4046–4069.
- Brems, Cara, Martina Temmerman, Todd Graham, and Marcel Broersma. 2017. Personal branding on Twitter: How employed and freelance journalists stage themselves on social media. *Digital Journalism* 5 (4): 443–459. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2016.1176534>.
- Brinkerhoff, Jennifer M. 2009. *Digital Diasporas: Identity and Transnational Engagement*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brock, André L. 2020. *Distributed Blackness: African American Cybercultures*. New York: New York University Press.

Broniatowski, David A., Amelia M. Jamison, SiHua Qi, Lulwah AlKulaib, Tao Chen, Adrian Benton, Sandra C. Quinn, and Mark Dredze. 2018. Weaponized health communication: Twitter bots and Russian trolls amplify the vaccine debate. *American Journal of Public Health* 108 (10): 1378–1384. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2018.304567>.

Brosius, Hans-Bernd, and Hans Mathias Kepplinger. 1990. The agenda-setting function of television news: Static and dynamic views. *Communication Research* 17 (2): 183–211. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009365090017002003>.

Brüggemann, Michael, Sven Engesser, Florin Büchel, Edda Humprecht, and Laia Castro. 2014. Hallin and Mancini revisited: Four empirical types of Western media systems. *Journal of Communication* 64 (6): 1037–1065. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12127>.

Bruns, Axel. 2019. *Are Filter Bubbles Real?* Cambridge: Polity.

Brydges, Taylor, and Jenny Sjöholm. 2019. Becoming a personal style blogger: Changing configurations and spatialities of aesthetic labour in the fashion industry. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 22 (1): 119–139. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367877917752404>.

Bucher, Taina. 2012. Want to be on the top? Algorithmic power and the threat of invisibility on Facebook. *New Media & Society* 14 (7): 1164–1180. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444812440159>.

Bucher, Taina. 2021. *Facebook*. Cambridge: Polity.

Burgess, Jean, and Nancy K. Baym. 2020. *Twitter: A Biography*. New York: New York University Press.

Burgess, Jean, and Joshua Green. 2018. *YouTube: Online Video and Participatory Culture*. Cambridge: Polity.

Burgess, Jean, Alice E. Marwick, and Thomas Poell. 2018. *The SAGE Handbook of Social Media*. London: SAGE Reference.

Canter, Lily. 2015. Personalised tweeting: The emerging practices of journalists on Twitter. *Digital Journalism* 3 (6): 888–907. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2014.973148>.

Castañeda, Ernesto. 2012. The *Indignados* of Spain: A precedent to Occupy Wall Street. *Social Movement Studies* 11 (3–4): 309–319. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2012.708830>.

Castells, Manuel. 2004. *The Network Society: A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

- Chadwick, Andrew. 2017. *The Hybrid Media System: Politics and Power*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chan, Joseph M., and Chin-Chuan Lee. 1984. Journalistic “paradigms” of civil protests: A case study in Hong Kong. In *The News Media in National and International Conflict*, edited by Andrew Arno, and Wimal Dissanayake, 183–202. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Chen, Hsuan-Ting, Michael Chan, and Francis L. F. Lee. 2016. Social media use and democratic engagement: A comparative study of Hong Kong, Taiwan, and China. *Chinese Journal of Communication* 9 (4): 348–366. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17544750.2016.1210182>.
- Cheruiyot, David. 2021. The (other) anglophone problem: Charting the development of a journalism subfield. *African Journalism Studies* 42 (2): 94–105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23743670.2021.1939750>.
- Chorianopoulos, Konstantinos, and George Lekakos. 2008. Introduction to social TV: Enhancing the shared experience with interactive TV. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction* 24 (2): 113–120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447310701821574>.
- Christin, Angèle, and Rebecca Lewis. 2021. The drama of metrics: Status, spectacle, and resistance among YouTube drama creators. *Social Media + Society* 7 (1): 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305121999660>.
- Chu, Shu-Chuan, and Sejung Marina Choi. 2010. Social capital and self-presentation on social networking sites: A comparative study of Chinese and American young generations. *Chinese Journal of Communication* 3 (4): 402–420. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17544750.2010.516575>.
- Chua, Trudy Hui, and Leanne Chang. 2016. Follow me and like my beautiful selfies: Singapore teenage girls’ engagement in self-presentation and peer comparison on social media. *Computers in Human Behavior* 55:190–197. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.09.011>.
- Chun, Wendy Hui Kyong. 2008. *Updating to Remain the Same: Habitual New Media*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chun, Wendy Hui Kyong. 2011. The enduring ephemeral, or the future is a memory. In *Media Archaeology: Approaches, Applications, and Implications*, edited by Erkki Huhtamo and Jussi Parikka, 184–206. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Chun, Wendy Hui Kyong, Anna Watkins Fisher, and Thomas Keenan, eds. 2005. *New Media, Old Media: A History and Theory Reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Cobo, Leila. 2020. Bad Bunny talks surprise new album “El ultimo tour del mundo” & Rosalia collab. *Billboard*, November, 27, 2020. <https://www.billboard.com/articles/columns/latin/9490254/bad-bunny-surprise-album-interview-el-ultimo-tour-del-mundo-rosalia>.

- Cohen, Bernard Cecil. 1963. *The Press and Foreign Policy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Colleoni, Elanor, Alessandro Rozza, and Adam Arvidsson. 2014. Echo chamber or public sphere? Predicting political orientation and measuring political homophily in Twitter using big data. *Journal of Communication* 64 (2): 317–332. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12084>.
- Collier, David. 1993. The comparative method. In *Political Science: The State of Discipline II*, edited by Ada W. Finifter, 105–119. Washington, DC: American Political Science Association.
- Corazza, Michele, Stefano Menini, Elena Cabrio, Sara Tonelli, and Serena Villata. 2019. Cross-platform evaluation for Italian hate speech detection. In *CLiC-it 2019–6th Annual Conference of the Italian Association for Computational Linguistics*. Bari, Italy.
- Costanza-Chock, Sasha. 2014. *Out of the Shadows, Into the Streets!: Transmedia Organizing and the Immigrant Rights Movement*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Craig, David, Jian Lin, and Stuart Cunningham. 2021. *Wanghong as Social Media Entertainment in China*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Crawford, Kate, and Tarleton Gillespie. 2016. What is a flag for? Social media reporting tools and the vocabulary of complaint. *New Media & Society* 18 (3): 410–428. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814543163>.
- Curran, James, and Myung-Jin Park, eds. 2000. *De-Westernizing Media Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Czitrom, Daniel J. 1982. *Media and the American Mind: From Morse to McLuhan*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- deCordova, Richard. 1990. *Picture Personalities: The Emergence of the Star System in America*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- de Lenne, Orpha, Laura Vandenbosch, Steven Eggermont, Kathrin Karsay, and Jolien Trekels. 2020. Picture-perfect lives on social media: A cross-national study on the role of media ideals in adolescent well-being. *Media Psychology* 23 (1): 52–78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15213269.2018.1554494>.
- Del Vicario, Michela, Gianna Vivaldo, Alessandro Bessi, Fabiana Zollo, Antonio Scala, Guido Caldarelli, and Walter Quattrociocchi. 2016. Echo chambers: Emotional contagion and group polarization on Facebook. *Scientific Reports* 6:1–12. <https://www.nature.com/articles/srep37825>.
- de Saussure, Ferdinand. (1916) 1983. *Course in General Linguistics*, translated and annotated by Roy Harris. London: Duckworth.

- Desjardins, Renée. 2016. *Translation and Social Media: In Theory, in Training and in Professional Practice*. London: Palgrave.
- de Sola Pool, Ithiel. 1983. *Technologies of Freedom*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Deuze, Mark. 2003. The web and its journalism: Considering the consequences of different types of newsmedia online. *New Media & Society* 5 (2): 203–230. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444803005002004>.
- DeVito, Michael Ann, Jeremy Birnholtz, and Jeffery T. Hancock. 2017. Platforms, people, and perception: Using affordances to understand self-presentation on social media. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*, 740–754. New York: Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2998181.2998192>.
- DeVito, Michael Ann, Ashley Marie Walker, and Jeremy Birnholtz. 2018. “Too gay for Facebook”: Presenting LGBTQ+ identity throughout the personal social media ecosystem. In *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction CSCW*, 1–23. New York: Association for Computing Machinery. <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3274313>.
- Dimmick, John W. 2003. *Media Competition and Coexistence: The Theory of the Niche*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Dimmick, John, Yan Chen, and Zhan Li. 2004. Competition between the Internet and traditional news media: The gratification-opportunities niche dimension. *The Journal of Media Economics* 17 (1): 19–33. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327736me1701_2.
- Dimmick, John, John Christian Feaster, and Artemio Ramirez Jr. 2011. The niches of interpersonal media: Relationships in time and space. *New Media & Society* 13 (8): 1265–1282. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444811403445>.
- Donath, Judith, and danah boyd. 2004. Public displays of connection. *BT Technology Journal* 22 (4): 71–82. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:BTTJ.0000047585.06264.cc>
- Doughty, Mark, Duncan Rowland, and Shaun Lawson. 2012. Who is on your sofa? TV audience communities and second screening social networks. In *Proceedings of the 10th European Conference on Interactive TV and Video*, 79–86. New York: Association for Computing Machinery.
- Douglas, Susan J. 1989. *Inventing American Broadcasting, 1899–1922*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Douglas, Susan J., and Andrea M. McDonnell. 2019. *Celebrity: A History of Fame*. New York: New York University Press.
- Druckman, James N. 2003. The power of television images: The first Kennedy-Nixon debate revisited. *The Journal of Politics* 65 (2): 559–571. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2508.t01-1-00015>.

Dubois, Elizabeth, and Grant Blank. 2018. The echo chamber is overstated: The moderating effect of political interest and diverse media. *Information, Communication & Society* 21 (5): 729–745. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2018.1428656>.

Dubrofsky, Rachel E. 2011. Surveillance on reality television and Facebook: From authenticity to flowing data. *Communication Theory* 21 (2): 111–129. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2011.01378.x>.

Duffy, Brooke Erin. 2017. *(Not) Getting Paid to Do What You Love: Gender, Social Media, and Aspirational Work*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Duffy, Brooke Erin, and Ngai Keung Chan. 2019. “You never really know who’s looking”: Imagined surveillance across social media platforms. *New Media & Society* 21 (1): 119–138. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444818791318>.

Duguay, Stefanie. 2016. Lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans, and queer visibility through selfies: Comparing platform mediators across Ruby Rose’s Instagram and Vine presence. *Social Media + Society* 2 (2): 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305116641975>.

Dwyer, Catherine, Starr Hiltz, and Katia Passerini. 2007. Trust and privacy concern within social networking sites: A comparison of Facebook and MySpace. In *AMCIS 2007 Proceedings*. Keystone, CO: Association for Information Systems (AIS). <https://aisel.aisnet.org/amcis2007/339>.

Ellison, Nicole B., Charles Steinfield, and Cliff Lampe. 2007. The benefits of Facebook “friends”: Social capital and college students’ use of online social network sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 12 (4): 1143–1168. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00367.x>.

Emery, Edwin, and Michael C. Emery. 1978. *The Press and America: An Interpretative History of the Mass Media*, 4th ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Entman, Robert M., and Nikki Usher. 2018. Framing in a fractured democracy: Impacts of digital technology on ideology, power and cascading network activation. *Journal of Communication* 68 (2): 298–308. <https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqx019>.

Esser, Frank. 2019. Advances in comparative political communication research through contextualization and cumulation of evidence. *Political Communication* 36 (4): 680–686. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2019.1670904>.

Esser, Frank, and Thomas Hanitzsch. 2012. *Handbook of Comparative Communication Research*. New York: Routledge.

Esser, Frank, and Barbara Pfetsch, eds. 2004. *Comparing Political Communication: Theories, Cases, and Challenges*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Esser, Frank, and Rens Vliegenthart. 2017. Comparative research methods. In *The International Encyclopedia of Communication Research Methods*, edited by Jörg Matthes, Christine S. Davis, and Robert F. Potter, 1–22. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Evans, Elizabeth. 2011. *Transmedia Television: Audiences, New Media, and Daily Life*. New York: Routledge.

Faist, Thomas. 2004. The transnational turn in migration research: Perspectives for the study of politics and polity. In *Transnational Spaces: Disciplinary Perspectives*, edited by Maja Povrzanović Frykman, 11–45. Malmö: Malmö University Press.

Ferguson, Douglas A. 1992. Profile: Channel repertoire in the presence of remote control devices, VCRs and cable television. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 36 (1): 83–91. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08838159209364156>.

Ferguson, Douglas A., and Elizabeth M. Perse. 1993. Media and audience influences on channel repertoire. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 37 (1): 31–47. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08838159309364202>.

Fischer, Claude S. 1992. *America Calling: A Social History of the Telephone to 1940*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Flaxman, Seth, Sharad Goel, and Justin M. Rao. 2016. Filter bubbles, echo chambers, and online news consumption. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 80 (S1): 298–320. <https://doi.org/10.1093/poq/nfw006>.

Flesher Fominaya, Cristina. 2015. Debunking spontaneity: Spain's 15-M/*Indignados* as autonomous movement. *Social Movement Studies* 14 (2): 142–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14742837.2014.945075>.

Fletcher, Richard, Alessio Cornia, and Rasmus Kleis Nielsen. 2020. How polarized are online and offline news audiences? A comparative analysis of twelve countries. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 25 (2): 169–195. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1940161219892768>.

Foot, Kirsten. 2014. The online emergence of pushback on social media in the United States: A historical discourse analysis. *International Journal of Communication* 8:1313–1342.

French, Megan, and Natalya N. Bazarova. 2017. Is anybody out there? Understanding masspersonal communication through expectations for response across social media platforms. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 22 (6): 303–319. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12197>.

Fuchs, Christian. 2016. Baidu, Weibo and Renren: The global political economy of social media in China. *Asian Journal of Communication* 26 (1): 14–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01292986.2015.1041537>.

Fuchs, Christian, and Jack Linchuan Qiu. 2018. Ferments in the field: Introductory reflections on the past, present and future of communication studies. *Journal of Communication* 68 (2): 219–232. <https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqy008>.

Furedi, Frank. 2016. Moral panic and reading: Early elite anxieties about the media effect. *Cultural Sociology* 10 (4): 523–537. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1749975515626953>.

Gabore, Samuel Mochona, and Deng Xiujun. 2018. Opinion formation in social media: The influence of online news dissemination on Facebook posts. *Communication* 44 (2): 20–40. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02500167.2018.1504097>.

Gainous, Jason, Kevin M. Wagner, and Jason P. Abbott. 2015. Civic disobedience: Does internet use stimulate political unrest in East Asia? *Journal of Information Technology & Politics* 12 (2): 219–236. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19331681.2015.1034909>.

Galison, Peter. 1997. *Image and Logic*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Galison, Peter. 1999. Trading Zone: Coordinating action and belief (1998 abridgment). In *The Science Studies Reader*, edited by Mario Biagioli, 137–160. New York: Routledge.

Galison, Peter. 2010. Trading with the enemy. In *Trading Zones and International Expertise: Creating New Kinds of Collaboration*, edited by Michael E. Gorman, 25–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gamson, Joshua. 1994. *Claims to Fame: Celebrity in Contemporary America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Geertz, Clifford. 1980. Blurred genres: The refiguration of social thought. *The American Scholar* 49 (2): 165–179.

Gerber, Alan S., Dean Karlan, and Daniel Bergan. 2009. Does the media matter? A field experiment measuring the effect of newspapers on voting behavior and political opinions. *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 1 (2): 35–52. <https://www.aeaweb.org/articles?id=10.1257/app.1.2.35>.

Gerbner, George, and Marsha Siefert, eds. 1983. *Ferment in the Field: Communications Scholars Address Critical Issues and Research Tasks of the Discipline*. Philadelphia: Annenberg School Press.

Gibbs, Martin, James Meese, Michael Arnold, Bjorn Nansen, and Marcus Carter. 2015. #Funeral and Instagram: Death, social media, and platform vernacular. *Information, Communication & Society* 18 (3): 255–268. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2014.987152>.

Giglietto, Fabio, and Donatella Selva. 2014. Second screen and participation: A content analysis on a full season dataset of tweets. *Journal of Communication* 64 (2): 260–277. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12085>.

Gil de Zúñiga, Homero, and James H. Liu. 2017. Second screening politics in the social media sphere: Advancing research on dual screen use in political communication with evidence from 20 countries. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 61 (2): 193–219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2017.1309420>.

- Gil de Zúñiga, Homero, Víctor García-Perdomo, and Shannon C. McGregor. 2015. What is second screening? Exploring motivations of second screen use and its effect on online political participation. *Journal of Communication* 65 (5): 793–815. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12174>.
- Gil de Zúñiga, Homero, Nakwon Jung, and Sebastián Valenzuela. 2012. Social media use for news and individuals' social capital, civic engagement and political participation. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 17 (3): 319–336. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2012.01574.x>.
- Gillespie, Marie, Souad Osseiran, and Margie Cheesman. 2018. Syrian refugees and the digital passage to Europe: Smartphone infrastructures and affordances. *Social Media + Society* 4 (1): 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305118764440>.
- Gillespie, Tarleton. 2010. The politics of “platforms.” *New Media & Society* 12 (3): 347–364. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444809342738>.
- Gillespie, Tarleton. 2018. *Custodians of the Internet: Platforms, Content Moderation, and the Hidden Decisions That Shape Social Media*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Gitelman, Lisa. 2006. *Always Already New: Media, History and the Data of Culture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Gitlin, Todd. 1980. *The Whole World Is Watching: Mass Media in the Making & Unmaking of the New Left*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Glynn, Kevin. 2000. *Tabloid Culture: Trash Taste, Popular Power, and the Transformation of American Television*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Anchor.
- Goffman, Erving. 1967. *Interaction Ritual: Essays in Face to Face Behavior*. Chicago: Aldine Transaction.
- Goggin, Gerard, and McLelland, Mark J. 2009. Internationalizing Internet studies: Beyond anglophone paradigms. In *Internationalizing Internet Studies: Beyond Anglophone Paradigms*, edited by Gerard Goggin and Mark J. McLelland, 3–17. New York: Routledge.
- Gómez-Cruz, Edgar, and Ignacio Siles. 2021. Visual communication in practice: A texto-material approach to WhatsApp in Mexico City. *International Journal of Communication* 15:4546–4566.
- Gottlieb, Nanette. 2009. Language on the internet in Japan. In *Internationalizing Internet Studies: Beyond Anglophone Paradigms*, edited by Gerard Goggin and Mark J. McLelland, 65–78. New York: Routledge.
- Gray, Kishonna L. 2020. *Intersectional Tech: Black Users in Digital Gaming*. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State University Press.

Grint, Keith, and Steve Woolgar. 1992. Computers, guns, and roses: What's social about being shot? *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 17 (3): 366–380. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016224399201700306>.

Guerrero, Manuel, and Mireya Márquez-Ramírez, eds. 2014. *Media Systems and Communication Policies in Latin America*. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gurevitch, Michael, and Jay G. Blumler. 1990. Political communication systems and democratic values. In *Democracy and the Mass Media: A Collection of Essays*, edited by Judith Lichtenberg, 269–289. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gutiérrez-Martín, Alfonso, and Alba Torrego-González. 2018. The Twitter games: Media education, popular culture and multiscreen viewing in virtual concourses. *Information, Communication & Society* 21 (3): 434–447. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2017.1284881>.

Ha, Louisa, and Ling Fang. 2012. Internet experience and time displacement of traditional news media use: An application of the theory of the niche. *Telematics and Informatics* 29 (2): 177–186. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2011.06.001>.

Hall, Edward T. 1976. *Beyond Culture*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

Hall, Margeret, Athanasios Mazarakis, Martin Chorley, and Simon Caton. 2018. Editorial of the special issue on following user pathways: Key contributions and future directions in cross-platform social media research. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction* 34 (10): 895–912. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2018.1471575>.

Hall, Stuart. 1980. Cultural studies: Two paradigms. *Media, Culture & Society* 2 (1): 57–72. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016344378000200106>.

Hallin, Daniel C., and Paolo Mancini. 2004. *Comparing Media Systems: Three Models of Media and Politics*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hallin, Daniel C., and Paolo Mancini. 2017. Ten years after *Comparing Media Systems*: What have we learned? *Political Communication* 34 (2): 155–171. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2016.1233158>.

Halpern, Daniel, and Jennifer Gibbs. 2013. Social media as a catalyst for online deliberation? Exploring the affordances of Facebook and YouTube for political expression. *Computers in Human Behavior* 29 (3): 1159–1168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2012.10.008>.

Harder, Raymond A., Julie Sevenans, and Peter Van Aelst. 2017. Intermedia agenda setting in the social media age: How traditional players dominate the news agenda in election times. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 22 (3): 275–293. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1940161217704969>.

- Hargittai, Eszter. 2007. Whose space? Differences among users and non-users of social network sites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 13 (1): 276–297. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00396.x>.
- Hargittai, Eszter. 2020. Potential biases in big data: Omitted voices on social media. *Social Science Computer Review* 38 (1): 10–24. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439318788322>.
- Hargittai, Eszter, and Yu-li Patrick Hsieh. 2010. Predictors and consequences of differentiated practices on social network sites. *Information, Communication & Society* 13 (4): 515–536. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691181003639866>.
- Harlow, Summer. 2019. Framing #Ferguson: A comparative analysis of media tweets in the U.S., U.K., Spain, and France. *International Communication Gazette* 81 (6–8): 623–643. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1748048518822610>.
- Harlow, Summer, and Thomas J. Johnson. 2011. The Arab Spring| Overthrowing the Protest Paradigm? How *The New York Times*, Global Voices and Twitter Covered the Egyptian Revolution. *International Journal of Communication* 5:1359–1374.
- Harp, Dustin, Ingrid Bachmann, and Lei Guo. 2012. The whole online world is watching: Profiling social networking sites and activists in China, Latin America and the United States. *International Journal of Communication* 6:298–321.
- Harrington, Stephen, Tim Highfield, and Axel Bruns. 2013. More than a backchannel: Twitter and television. *Participations* 10 (1): 405–408.
- Hartley, John. 2018. Pushing back: Social media as an evolutionary phenomenon. In *The SAGE Handbook of Social Media*, edited by Jean Burgess, Alice E. Marwick, and Thomas Poell, 13–33. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Hasebrink, Uwe, and Andreas Hepp. 2017. How to research cross-media practices? Investigating media repertoires and media ensembles. *Convergence* 23 (4): 362–377. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354856517700384>.
- Hasebrink, Uwe, and Jutta Popp. 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. <https://doi.org/10.1515/COMMUN.2006.023>.
- Hayles, N. Katherine. 2007. Intermediation: The pursuit of a vision. *New Literary History* 38 (1): 99–125. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20057991>.
- Hedman, Ulrika, and Monika Djerf-Pierre. 2013. The social journalist: Embracing the social media life or creating a new digital divide? *Digital Journalism* 1 (3): 368–385. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2013.776804>.
- Heeter, Carrie. 1985. Program selection with abundance of choice: A process model. *Human Communication Research* 12 (1): 126–152. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1985.tb00070.x>.

- Hegde, Radha Sarma. 2016. *Mediating Migration*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Hermida, Alfred. 2010. Twittering the news: The emergence of ambient journalism. *Journalism Practice* 4 (3): 297–308. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17512781003640703>.
- Hermida, Alfred. 2014. *Tell Everyone: Why We Share and Why It Matters*. Toronto: Anchor Canada.
- Herring, Susan C., ed. 1996. *Computer-Mediated Communication: Linguistic, Social, and Cross-Cultural Perspectives*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hessel, Stéphane. 2011. *Time for Outrage: Indignez-vous!* New York: Twelve Books.
- Hesselberth, Pepita. 2018. Discourses on disconnectivity and the right to disconnect. *New Media & Society* 20 (5): 1994–2010. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444817711449>.
- Highfield, Tim, Stephen Harrington, and Axel Bruns. 2013. Twitter as a technology for audiencing and fandom: The #Eurovision phenomenon. *Information, Communication & Society* 16 (3): 315–339.
- Highfield, Tim, and Tama Leaver. 2016. Instagrammatics and digital methods: Studying visual social media, from selfies and GIFs to memes and emoji. *Communication Research and Practice* 2 (1): 47–62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/22041451.2016.1155332>.
- Hill, Annette. 2011. *Paranormal Media: Audiences, Spirits and Magic in Popular Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Himmelboim, Itai, Stephen McCreery, and Marc Smith. 2013. Birds of a feather tweet together: Integrating network and content analyses to examine cross-ideology exposure on Twitter. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 18 (2): 154–174. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcc4.12001>.
- Hofstede, Geert H. 1983. National cultures in four dimensions: A research-based theory of cultural differences among nations. *International Studies of Management & Organization* 13 (1–2): 46–74. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00208825.1983.11656358>.
- Hofstede, Geert H. 1984. *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Abridged ed. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hofstede, Geert H. 1991. *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. London: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, Geert H. 1998. Attitudes, values and organizational culture: Disentangling the concepts. *Organization Studies* 19 (3): 477–493. <https://doi.org/10.1177/017084069801900305>.
- Holmes, Su, and Deborah Jermyn. 2004. *Understanding Reality Television*. London: Routledge.

- Hopke, Jill E. 2015. Hashtagging politics: Transnational anti-fracking movement Twitter practices. *Social Media + Society* 1 (2): 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305115605521>.
- Horvát, Emőke-Ágnes, and Eszter Hargittai. 2021. Birds of a feather flock together online: Digital inequality in social media repertoires. *Social Media + Society* 7 (4): 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051211052897>.
- Humphreys, Lee. 2018. *The Qualified Self: Social Media and the Accounting of Everyday Life*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Humphreys, Lee, Phillipa Gill, Balachander Krishnamurthy, and Elizabeth Newbury. 2013. Historicizing new media: A content analysis of Twitter. *Journal of Communication* 63 (3): 413–431. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12030>.
- Hunt, Melissa G., Rachel Marx, Courtney Lipson, and Jordyn Young. 2018. No more FOMO: Limiting social media decreases loneliness and depression. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology* 37 (10): 751–768. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2018.37.10.751>.
- Innis, Harold A. 1964. *The Bias of Communication*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Ito, Mizuko, Daisuke Okabe, and Misa Matsuda. 2005. *Personal, Portable, Pedestrian: Mobile Phones in Japanese Life*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jackson, Linda A., and Jin-Liang Wang. 2013. Cultural differences in social networking site use: A comparative study of China and the United States. *Computers in Human Behavior* 29 (3): 910–921. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2012.11.024>.
- Jackson, Sarah J., Moya Bailey, and Brooke Foucault Welles. 2020. *#HashtagActivism: Networks of Race and Gender Justice*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jackson, Sarah J., and Brooke Foucault Welles. 2015. Hijacking #MYNYPD: Social media dissent and networked counterpublics. *Journal of Communication* 65 (6): 932–952. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12185>.
- Jaramillo, Mary Correa. 2006. Desinformación y propaganda: Estrategias de gestión de la comunicación en el conflicto armado colombiano. *Reflexión Política* 8 (15): 94–106.
- Jasanoff, Sheila, and Sang-Hyun Kim, eds. 2015. *Dreamscapes of Modernity: Sociotechnical Imaginaries and the Fabrication of Power*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Jenkins, Henry. 2006. *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*. New York: New York University Press.
- Jenkins, Henry, Sam Ford, and Joshua Green. 2013. *Spreadable Media: Creating Value and Meaning in a Networked Culture*. New York: New York University Press.

Jenkins, Henry, Sangita Shresthova, Liana Gamber-Thompson, Neta Kligler-Vilenchik and Arely Zimmerman. 2016. *By Any Media Necessary: The New Youth Activism*. New York: New York University Press.

John, Nicholas A. 2013. Sharing and Web 2.0: The emergence of a keyword. *New Media & Society* 15 (2): 167–182. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444812450684>.

John, Nicholas A. 2017. *The Age of Sharing*. Malden, MA: Polity.

John, Nicholas A., and Shira Dvir-Gvirsman. 2015. “I don’t like you any more”: Facebook unfriending by Israelis during the Israel–Gaza conflict of 2014. *Journal of Communication* 65 (6): 953–974. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12188>.

Johns, Adrian. 1998. *The Nature of the Book: Print and Knowledge in the Making*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, Jessica. 2018. The self-radicalization of white men: “Fake news” and the affective networking of paranoia. *Communication Culture & Critique* 11 (1): 100–115. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ccc/tcx014>.

Johnson, Thomas, and David D. Perlmutter. 2011. *New Media, Campaigning and the 2008 Facebook Election*. London: Routledge.

Jones, Graham M. 2017. *Magic’s Reason: An Anthropology of Analogy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kalogeropoulos, Antonis, Samuel Negredo, Ike Picone, and Rasmus Kleis Nielsen. 2017. Who shares and comments on news? A cross-national comparative analysis of online and social media participation. *Social Media + Society* 3 (4): 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305117735754>.

Kalogeropoulos, Antonis, and Rasmus Kleis Nielsen. 2018. Investing in online video news: A cross-national analysis of news organizations’ enterprising approach to digital media. *Journalism Studies* 19 (15): 2207–2224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2017.1331709>.

Kalsnes, Bente, Arne H. Krumsvik, and Tanja Storsul. 2014. Social media as a political backchannel: Twitter use during televised election debates in Norway. *Aslib Journal of Information Management* 66 (3): 313–328. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/AJIM-09-2013-0093>.

Karapanos, Evangelos, Pedro Teixeira, and Ruben Gouveia. 2016. Need fulfillment and experiences on social media: A case on Facebook and WhatsApp. *Computers in Human Behavior* 55:888–897. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.10.015>.

Karim, Karim Haiderali, ed. 2003. *The Media of Diaspora*. London: Routledge.

Katz, James E., and Elizabeth Thomas Crocker. 2015. Selfies and photo messaging as visual conversation: Reports from the United States, United Kingdom and China. *International Journal of Communication* 9:1861–1872.

Kaun, Anne, and Fredrik Stiernstedt. 2014. Facebook time: Technological and institutional affordances for media memories. *New Media & Society* 16 (7): 1154–1168. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814544001>.

Kavanagh, Barry. 2016. Emoticons as a medium for channeling politeness within American and Japanese online blogging communities. *Language & Communication* 48:53–65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2016.03.003>.

Kaye, D. Bondy Valdovinos, Xu Chen, and Jing Zeng. 2021. The co-evolution of two Chinese mobile short video apps: Parallel platformization of Douyin and TikTok. *Mobile Media & Communication* 9 (2): 229–253. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2050157920952120>.

Khamis, Susie, Lawrence Ang, and Raymond Welling. 2017. Self-branding, “micro-celebrity” and the rise of social media influencers. *Celebrity Studies* 8 (2): 191–208. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19392397.2016.1218292>.

Kies, Bridget. 2021. Remediating the celebrity roast: The place of mean tweets on late-night television. *Television & New Media* 22 (5): 516–528. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1527476419892581>.

Kim, Su Jung. 2016. A repertoire approach to cross-platform media use behavior. *New Media & Society* 18 (3): 353–372. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814543162>.

Kim, Yoojung, Dongyoung Sohn, and Sejung Marina Choi. 2011. Cultural difference in motivations for using social network sites: A comparative study of American and Korean college students. *Computers in Human Behavior* 27 (1): 365–372. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2010.08.015>.

Kim, Young Yun. 2012. Comparing intercultural communication. In *Handbook of Comparative Communication Research*, edited by Frank Esser and Thomas Hanitzsch, 119–133. New York: Routledge.

Kline, Ronald R. 2000. *Consumers in the Country: Technology and Social Change in Rural America*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Kling, Rob. 1992. Audiences, narratives, and human values in social studies of technology. *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 17 (3): 349–365. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016224399201700305>.

Kluitenberg, Eric. 2011. On the archeology of imaginary media. In *Media Archaeology: Approaches, Applications, and Implications*, edited by Erkki Huhtamo and Jussi Parikka, 48–69. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Knobel, Michele, and Colin Lankshear. 2008. Remix: The art and craft of endless hybridization. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy* 52 (1): 22–33. <https://doi.org/10.1598/JAAL.52.1.3>.

Knorr-Cetina, Karin. 2009. The synthetic situation: Interactionism for a global world. *Symbolic Interaction* 32 (1): 61–87. <https://doi.org/10.1525/si.2009.32.1.61>.

- Koskela, Hille. 2004. Webcams, TV shows and mobile phones: Empowering exhibitionism. *Surveillance & Society* 2 (2/3): 199–215.
- Kraidy, Marwan M. 2005. *Hybridity, or the Cultural Logic of Globalization*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Kraidy, Marwan M. 2009. *Reality Television and Arab Politics: Contention in Public Life*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Kraidy, Marwan M. 2016. *The Naked Blogger of Cairo: Creative Insurgency in the Arab World*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ksiazek, Thomas B., Limor Peer, and Kevin Lessard. 2016. User engagement with online news: Conceptualizing interactivity and exploring the relationship between online news videos and user comments. *New Media & Society* 18 (3): 502–520. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814545073>.
- Ku, Yi-Cheng, Rui Chen, and Han Zhang. 2013. Why do users continue using social networking sites? An exploratory study of members in the United States and Taiwan. *Information & Management* 50 (7): 571–581. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2013.07.011>.
- Kwak, Haewoon, Changhyun Lee, Hosung Park, and Sue Moon. 2010. What is Twitter, a social network or a news media? In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on World Wide Web*, 591–600. New York: Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1772690.1772751>.
- Lacour, Philippe, Any Freitas, Aurélien Bénel, Franck Eyraud, and Diana Zambon. 2013. Enhancing linguistic diversity through collaborative translation. In *Social Media and Minority Languages: Convergence and the Creative Industries*, edited by Elin Haf Gruffydd Jones and Enrique Uribe-Jongbloed, 159–172. Bristol, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- LaRose, Robert, Regina Connolly, Hyegy Lee, Kang Li, and Kayla D. Hales. 2014. Connection overload? A cross cultural study of the consequences of social media connection. *Information Systems Management* 31 (1): 59–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10580530.2014.854097>.
- Larsson, Anders Olof. 2015. Comparing to prepare: Suggesting ways to study social media today—and tomorrow. *Social Media + Society* 1 (1): 1–2. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305115578680>.
- Lasorsa, Dominic L., Seth C. Lewis, and Avery E. Holton. 2012. Normalizing Twitter: Journalism practice in an emerging communication space. *Journalism Studies* 13 (1): 19–36. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2011.571825>.
- Latonero, Mark, and Paula Kift. 2018. On digital passages and borders: Refugees and the new infrastructure for movement and control. *Social Media + Society* 4 (1): 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305118764432>.

- Lazer, David, Alex Pentland, Lada Adamic, Sinan Aral, Albert-László Barabási, Devon Brewer, Nicholas Christakis, et al. 2009. Computational social science. *Science (American Association for the Advancement of Science)* 323 (5915): 721–723. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1167742>.
- Lécuyer, Christophe. 2006. *Making Silicon Valley: Innovation and the Growth of High Tech, 1930–1970*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lee, Jae Kook, Jihyang Choi, Cheonsoo Kim, and Yonghwan Kim. 2014. Social media, network heterogeneity, and opinion polarization. *Journal of Communication* 64 (4): 702–722. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12077>.
- Lehman-Wilzig, Sam, and Nava Cohen-Avigdor. 2004. The natural life cycle of new media evolution: Inter-media struggle for survival in the internet age. *New Media & Society* 6 (6): 707–730. <https://doi.org/10.1177/146144804042524>.
- Lemke, Jeslyn, and Endalk Chala. 2016. Tweeting democracy: An ethnographic content analysis of social media use in the differing politics of Senegal and Ethiopia's newspapers. *Journal of African Media Studies* 8 (2): 167–185. https://doi.org/10.1386/jams.8.2.167_1.
- Lenihan, Aoife. 2014. Investigating language policy in social media: Translation practices on Facebook. In *The Language of Social Media: Identity and Community on the Internet*, edited by Philip Seargeant and Caroline Tagg, 208–227. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Leppänen, Sirpa, and Ari Häkkinen. 2013. Buffalaxed superdiversity: Representations of the other on YouTube. *Diversities* 14 (2): 17–33. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000222415>.
- Leurs, Koen. 2019. Transnational connectivity and the affective paradoxes of digital care labour: Exploring how young refugees technologically mediate co-presence. *European Journal of Communication* 34 (6): 641–649. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323119886166>.
- Leurs, Koen, and Madhuri Prabhakar. 2018. Doing digital migration studies: Methodological considerations for an emerging research focus. In *Qualitative Research in European Migration Studies*, edited by Ricard Zapata-Barrero and Evren Yalaz, 247–266. Cham, Switzerland: Springer International.
- Leurs, Koen, and Kevin Smets. 2018. Five questions for digital migration studies: Learning from digital connectivity and forced migration in(to) Europe. *Social Media + Society* 4 (1): 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305118764425>.
- Levy, Mark R., and Michael Gurevitch. 1993. Editor's Note. *Journal of Communication* 43 (3): 4–5. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01270.x>.
- Lewis, Rebecca. 2020. “This is what the news won't show you”: YouTube creators and the reactionary politics of micro-celebrity. *Television & New Media* 21 (2): 201–217. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1527476419879919>.

Liao, Q. Vera, and Wai-Tat Fu. 2013. Beyond the filter bubble: Interactive effects of perceived threat and topic involvement on selective exposure to information. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 2359–2368. New York: Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2470654.2481326>.

Lievrouw, Leah A., and Sonia M. Livingstone. 2002. Introduction: The Social Shaping and Consequences of ICTs. In *Handbook of New Media: Social Shaping and Consequences of ICTs*, edited by Leah A. Lievrouw and Sonia Livingstone, 1–16. London: SAGE.

Lijphart, Arend. 1971. Comparative politics and the comparative method. *The American Political Science Review* 65 (3): 682–693. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1955513>.

Lim, Tae-Seop. 2002. Language and verbal communication across cultures. In *Handbook of International and Intercultural Communication*, edited by William B. Gudykunst and Bella Mody, 69–87. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Lin, Luc Chia-Shin. 2016. Convergence in election campaigns: The frame contest between Facebook and mass media. *Convergence* 22 (2): 199–214. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1354856514545706>.

Lin, Trisha T. C. 2019. Why do people watch multiscreen videos and use dual screening? Investigating users' polychronicity, media multitasking motivation, and media repertoire. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction* 35 (18): 1672–1680. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2018.1561813>.

Ling, Rich. 2020. Confirmation bias in the era of mobile news consumption: The social and psychological dimensions. *Digital Journalism* 8 (5): 596–604. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2020.1766987>.

Litt, Eden. 2012. *Knock, knock*. Who's there? The imagined audience. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 56 (3): 330–345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2012.705195>.

Litt, Eden, and Eszter Hargittai. 2016. The imagined audience on social network sites. *Social Media + Society* 2 (1): 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305116633482>.

Livingstone, Sonia. 2003. On the challenges of cross-national comparative media research. *European Journal of Communication* 18 (4): 477–500. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323103184003>.

Livingstone, Sonia. 2012. Challenges to comparative research in a globalizing media landscape. In *Handbook of Comparative Communication Research*, edited by Frank Esser and Thomas Hanitzsch, 415–429. New York: Routledge.

Lobato, Ramon. 2018. Rethinking international TV flows research in the age of Netflix. *Television & New Media* 19 (3): 241–256. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1527476417708245>.

- Long, Pamela O. 2015. Trading zones in early modern Europe. *Isis* 106 (4): 840–847. <https://doi.org/10.1086/684652>.
- Lotan, Gilad, Erhardt Graeff, Mike Ananny, Devin Gaffney, and Ian Pearce. 2011. The revolutions were tweeted: Information flows during the 2011 Tunisian and Egyptian revolutions. *International Journal of Communication* 5:1375–1405.
- Lu, Jessica H, and Catherine Knight Steele. 2019. “Joy is resistance”: Cross-platform resilience and (re)invention of Black oral culture online. *Information, Communication & Society* 22 (6): 823–837. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2019.1575449>.
- Lukito, Josephine. 2020. Coordinating a multi-platform disinformation campaign: Internet research agency activity on three U.S. social media platforms, 2015 to 2017. *Political Communication* 37 (2): 238–255. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2019.1661889>.
- Madianou, Mirca. 2015. Polymedia and ethnography: Understanding the social in social media. *Social Media + Society* 1 (1): 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305115578675>.
- Madianou, Mirca. 2016. Ambient co-presence: Transnational family practices in polymedia environments. *Global Networks* 16 (2): 183–201. <https://doi.org/10.1111/glob.12105>.
- Madianou, Mirca. 2019. Technocolonialism: Digital innovation and data practices in the humanitarian response to refugee crises. *Social Media + Society* 5 (3): 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305119863146>.
- Madianou, Mirca, and Daniel Miller. 2012. *Migration and New Media: Transnational Families and Polymedia*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Madianou, Mirca, and Daniel Miller. 2013. Polymedia: Towards a new theory of digital media in interpersonal communication. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 16 (2): 169–187. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1367877912452486>.
- Mahajan, Khyati, and Samira Shaikh. 2019. Emoji usage across platforms: A case study for the Charlottesville Event. In *WNLP@ ACL*, 160–162. Florence, Italy: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Manovich, Lev. 2002. *The Language of New Media*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Marcin, Tim. 2020. One man’s frustrating journey to recovering his Myspace. *Mashable*, October 10. <https://mashable.com/article/how-to-recover-access-myspace-profile>.
- Mars, Amanda. 2021. Hay que romper eso de que los gringos son dioses . . . No, papi. *El País*, January, 2. https://elpais.com/elpais/2020/12/30/eps/1609327975_051296.html.

- Marshall, P. David. 2010. The promotion and presentation of the self: Celebrity as marker of presentational media. *Celebrity Studies* 1 (1): 35–48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19392390903519057>.
- Marvin, Carolyn. 1988. *When Old Technologies Were New: Thinking About Electric Communication in the Late Nineteenth Century*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Marwick, Alice E. 2013. *Status Update: Celebrity, Publicity, and Branding in the Social Media Age*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Marwick, Alice E. 2015. Instafame: Luxury selfies in the attention economy. *Public Culture* 27 (1): 137–160. <https://doi.org/10.1215/08992363-2798379>.
- Marwick, Alice E. 2018. Silicon Valley and the social media industry. In *The SAGE Handbook of Social Media*, edited by Jean Burgess, Alice E. Marwick, and Thomas Poell, 314–329. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Marwick, Alice E., and danah boyd. 2011. I tweet honestly, I tweet passionately: Twitter users, context collapse, and the imagined audience. *New Media & Society* 13 (1): 114–133. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444810365313>.
- Marwick, Alice E., and danah boyd. 2014. Networked privacy: How teenagers negotiate context in social media. *New Media & Society* 16 (7): 1051–1067. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814543995>.
- Marx, Leo. 1964. *The Machine in the Garden: Technology and the Pastoral Ideal in America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Marx, Leo, and Merritt Roe Smith. 1994. *Does Technology Drive History? The Dilemma of Technological Determinism*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Masullo, Gina, M., Paromita Pain, Victoria Y. Chen, Madlin Mekelburg, Nina Springer, and Franziska Troger. 2020. “You really have to have a thick skin”: A cross-cultural perspective on how online harassment influences female journalists. *Journalism* 21 (7): 877–895. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884918768500>.
- Matamoros-Fernández, Ariadna. 2017. Platformed racism: The mediation and circulation of an Australian race-based controversy on Twitter, Facebook and YouTube. *Information, Communication & Society* 20 (6): 930–946. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2017.1293130>.
- Matassi, Mora, and Pablo Boczkowski. 2021. An agenda for comparative social media studies: The value of understanding social media practices from cross-media, cross-national, and cross-platform perspectives. *International Journal of Communication* 15:207–228. <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/15042>.
- Matassi, Mora, Eugenia Mitchelstein, and Pablo J. Boczkowski. 2022. Social media repertoires: Social structure and platform use. *The Information Society* 38 (2): 133–146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01972243.2022.2028208>.

- McCombs, Maxwell E., and Donald L. Shaw. 1972. The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 36 (2): 176–187. <https://doi.org/10.1086/267990>.
- McCombs, Maxwell E., Donald L. Shaw, and David H. Weaver. 2014. New directions in agenda-setting theory and research. *Mass Communication and Society* 17 (6): 781–802. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2014.964871>.
- McCombs, Maxwell, and Sebastián Valenzuela. 2021. *Setting the Agenda: Mass Media and Public Opinion*. 3rd edition. Cambridge: Polity.
- McLelland, Jack, Haiqing Yu, and Gerard Goggin. 2018. Alternative histories of social media in Japan and China. In *The SAGE Handbook of Social Media*, edited by Jean Burgess, Alice E. Marwick, and Thomas Poell, 53–68. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- McLeod, Douglas M., and James K. Hertog. 1992. The manufacture of “public opinion” by reporters: Informal cues for public perceptions of protest groups. *Discourse & Society* 3 (3): 259–275. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926592003003001>.
- McLuhan, Marshall. (1964) 2003. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. New York: Ginko Press.
- McPherson, Miller, Lynn Smith-Lovin, and James M. Cook. 2001. Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology* 27 (1): 415–444. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.27.1.415>.
- Meehan, Mary Beth, and Fred Turner. 2021. *Seeing Silicon Valley: Life Inside a Fraying America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mellado, Claudia, and Alfred Hermida. 2021. The promoter, celebrity, and joker roles in journalists’ social media performance. *Social Media + Society* 7 (1): 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305121990643>.
- Messing, Solomon, and Sean J. Westwood. 2014. Selective exposure in the age of social media: Endorsements trump partisan source affiliation when selecting news online. *Communication Research* 41 (8): 1042–1063. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650212466406>.
- Meyrowitz, Joshua. 1985. *No Sense of Place: The Impact of Electronic Media on Social Behavior*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Miller, Daniel, Jolynna Sinanan, Xinyuan Wang, Tom McDonald, Nell Haynes, Elisabetta Costa, Juliano Spyer, et al. 2016. *How the World Changed Social Media*. London: University College London Press.
- Mocanu, Delia, Andrea Baronchelli, Nicola Perra, Bruno Gonçalves, Qian Zhang, and Alessandro Vespignani. 2013. The Twitter of Babel: Mapping world languages through microblogging platforms. *PLoS ONE* 8 (4): e61981. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0061981>.

- Morley, David, and Kevin Robins. 2002. *Spaces of Identity: Global Media, Electronic Landscapes and Cultural Boundaries*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Morris, Nancy, and Silvio Waisbord, eds. 2001. *Media and Globalization: Why the State Matters*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Mosca, Lorenzo, and Mario Quaranta. 2016. News diets, social media use and non-institutional participation in three communication ecologies: Comparing Germany, Italy and the UK. *Information, Communication & Society* 19 (3): 325–345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2015.1105276>.
- Mourão, Rachel R. 2019. From mass to elite protests: News coverage and the evolution of antigovernment demonstrations in Brazil. *Mass Communication and Society* 22 (1): 49–71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15205436.2018.1498899>.
- Mullaney, Thomas S. 2017. *The Chinese Typewriter: A History*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Murray, Susan, and Laurie Ouellette. 2004. *Reality TV: Remaking Television Culture*. New York: New York University Press.
- Murthy, Dhiraj. 2018. *Twitter: Social Communication in the Twitter Age*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Nakamura, Lisa, and Peter Chow-White, eds. 2012. *Race After the Internet*. New York: Routledge.
- Nedelcu, Mihaela. 2012. Migrants' new transnational habitus: Rethinking migration through a cosmopolitan lens in the digital age. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 38 (9): 1339–1356. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2012.698203>.
- Nedelcu, Mihaela, and Malika Wyss. 2016. "Doing family" through ICT-mediated ordinary co-presence: Transnational communication practices of Romanian migrants in Switzerland. *Global Networks* 16 (2): 202–218. <https://doi.org/10.1111/glob.12110>.
- Nee, Rebecca C., and Valerie Barker. 2020. Co-viewing virtually: Social outcomes of second screening with televised and streamed content. *Television & New Media* 21 (7): 712–729. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1527476419853450>.
- Neuman, W. Russell, Lauren Guggenheim, S. Mo Jang, and Soo Young Bae. 2014. The dynamics of public attention: Agenda-setting theory meets big data. *Journal of Communication* 64 (2): 193–214. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcom.12088>.
- Nielsen, Rasmus Kleis, and Sarah Anne Ganter. 2022. *The Power of Platforms: Shaping Media and Society*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nielsen, Rasmus Kleis, and Kim Christian Schrøder. 2014. The relative importance of social media for accessing, finding, and engaging with news: An eight-country

- cross-media comparison. *Digital Journalism* 2 (4): 472–489. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2013.872420>.
- Nissenbaum, Asaf, and Limor Shifman. 2022. Laughing alone, together: Local user-generated satirical responses to a global event. *Information, Communication & Society* 25 (7): 924–941. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2020.1804979>.
- Noble, Safiya Umoja. 2018. *Algorithms of Oppression: How Search Engines Reinforce Racism*. New York: New York University Press.
- Norris, Pippa. 2009. Comparative political communications: Common frameworks or Babelian confusion? *Government and Opposition* 44 (3): 321–340. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1477-7053.2009.01290.x>.
- Ong, Walter J. 1982. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word*. London: Methuen.
- Orben, Amy. 2020. The Sisyphian cycle of technology panics. *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 15 (5): 1143–1157. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620919372>.
- Ozimek, Phillip, and Hans-Werner Bierhoff. 2020. All my online-friends are better than me—Three studies about ability-based comparative social media use, self-esteem, and depressive tendencies. *Behaviour & Information Technology* 39 (10): 1110–1123. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0144929X.2019.1642385>.
- Papa, Venetia, and Dimitra L. Milioni. 2016. “I don’t wear blinkers, all right?”: The multiple meanings of civic identity in the *Indignados* and the role of social media. *Javnost-The Public* 23 (3): 290–306. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13183222.2016.1210464>.
- Papacharissi, Zizi. 2009. The virtual geographies of social networks: A comparative analysis of Facebook, LinkedIn and ASmallWorld. *New Media & Society* 11 (1–2): 199–220. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444808099577>.
- Papacharissi, Zizi. 2010. *A Private Sphere: Democracy in a Digital Age*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Papacharissi, Zizi, and Maria de Fatima Oliveira. 2012. Affective news and networked publics: The rhythms of news storytelling on #Egypt. *Journal of Communication* 62 (2): 266–282. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2012.01630.x>.
- Parikka, Jussi. 2012. *What Is Media Archaeology?* Cambridge: Polity.
- Pariser, Eli. 2011. *The Filter Bubble: What the Internet Is Hiding from You*. New York: Penguin.
- Parisi, Lorenza, and Francesca Comunello. 2020. Dating in the time of “relational filter bubbles”: Exploring imaginaries, perceptions and tactics of Italian dating app users. *The Communication Review* 23 (1): 66–89. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10714421.2019.1704111>.

Paulussen, Steve, and Raymond A. Harder. 2014. Social media references in newspapers: Facebook, Twitter and YouTube as sources in newspaper journalism. *Journalism Practice* 8 (5): 542–551. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2014.894327>.

Pearce, Warren, Suay M. Özkula, Amanda K. Greene, Lauren Teeling, Jennifer S. Bansard, Janna Joceli Omena, and Elaine Teixeira Rabello. 2020. Visual cross-platform analysis: Digital methods to research social media images. *Information, Communication & Society* 23 (2): 161–180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2018.1486871>.

Peirce, Charles Sanders. 1984. Some consequences of four incapacities. In *Writings of Charles Sanders Peirce, A Chronological Edition. Vol. 2, 1867–1871*, 211–242. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Perse, Elizabeth M. 1990. Audience selectivity and involvement in the newer media environment. *Communication Research* 17 (5): 675–697.

Peters, Benjamin. 2009. And lead us not into thinking the new is new: A bibliographic case for new media history. *New Media & Society* 11 (1–2): 13–30. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444808099572>.

Pfau, Michael. 2008. Epistemological and disciplinary intersections. *Journal of Communication* 58 (4): 597–602. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.00414.x>.

Pinch, Trevor J., and Wiebe E. Bijker. 1984. The social construction of facts and artefacts: Or how the sociology of science and the sociology of technology might benefit each other. *Social Studies of Science* 14 (3): 399–441. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030631284014003004>.

Pittman, Matthew, and Brandon Reich. 2016. Social media and loneliness: Why an Instagram picture may be worth more than a thousand Twitter words. *Computers in Human Behavior* 62:155–167. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.03.084>.

Plantin, Jean-Christophe, Carl Lagoze, Paul N. Edwards, and Christian Sandvig. 2018. Infrastructure studies meet platform studies in the age of Google and Facebook. *New Media & Society* 20 (1): 293–310. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816661553>.

Plotnick, Rachel. 2018. *Power Button: A History of Pleasure, Panic, and the Politics of Pushing*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Polyakova, Alina. 2019. What the Mueller report tells us about Russian influence operations. *Brookings*, April 18. <https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2019/04/18/what-the-mueller-report-tells-us-about-russian-influence-operations>.

Postill, John. 2014. Democracy in an age of viral reality: A media epidemiography of Spain's indignados movement. *Ethnography* 15 (1): 51–69. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1466138113502513>.

Postman, Neil. 1986. *Amusing Ourselves to Death: Public Discourse in the Age of Show Business*. New York: Penguin Books.

- Prior, Markus. 2005. News vs. entertainment: How increasing media choice widens gaps in political knowledge and turnout. *American Journal of Political Science* 49 (3): 577–592. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2005.00143.x>.
- Psarras, Evie. 2020. “It’s a mix of authenticity and complete fabrication” Emotional camping: The cross-platform labor of the *Real Housewives*. *New Media & Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444820975025>.
- Qiu, Lin, Han Lin, and Angela K.-y. Leung. 2013. Cultural differences and switching of in-group sharing behavior between an American (Facebook) and a Chinese (Renren) social networking site. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 44 (1): 106–121. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022111434597>.
- Quan-Haase, Anabel, and Alyson L. Young. 2010. Uses and gratifications of social media: A comparison of Facebook and instant messaging. *Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society* 30 (5): 350–361. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0270467610380009>.
- Rainie, Harrison, and Barry Wellman. 2012. *Networked: The New Social Operating System*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Renninger, Bryce J. 2015. “Where I can be myself . . . where I can speak my mind”: Networked counterpublics in a polymedia environment. *New Media & Society* 17 (9): 1513–1529. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814530095>.
- Rice, Ronald E. 1999. Artifacts and paradoxes in new media. *New Media & Society* 1 (1): 24–32. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444899001001005>.
- Roberts, Sarah T. 2019. *Behind the Screen: Content Moderation in the Shadows of Social Media*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Rymarczuk, Robin. 2016. Same old story: On non-use and resistance to the telephone and social media. *Technology in Society* 45:40–47. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2016.02.003>.
- Salameh, Mohammad, Saif Mohammad, and Svetlana Kiritchenko. 2015. Sentiment after translation: A case-study on Arabic social media posts. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, 767–777. Denver, CO: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Saldaña, Magdalena, Shannon C. McGregor, and Homero Gil de Zúñiga. 2015. Social media as a public space for politics: Cross-national comparison of news consumption and participatory behaviors in the United States and the United Kingdom. *International Journal of Communication* 9 (1): 3304–3326.
- Sánchez-Querubín, Natalia, and Richard Rogers. 2018. Connected routes: Migration studies with digital devices and platforms. *Social Media + Society* 4 (1): 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305118764427>.

Saunders, Jessica F., and Asia A. Eaton. 2018. Snaps, selfies, and shares: How three popular social media platforms contribute to the sociocultural model of disordered eating among young women. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking* 21 (6): 343–354. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2017.0713>.

Saxenian, AnnaLee. 1996. *Regional Advantage: Culture and Competition in Silicon Valley and Route 128*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Sayre, Ben, Leticia Bode, Dhavan Shah, Dave Wilcox, and Chirag Shah. 2010. Agenda setting in a digital age: Tracking attention to California Proposition 8 in social media, online news and conventional news. *Policy & Internet* 2 (2): 7–32. <https://doi.org/10.2202/1944-2866.1040>.

Schmidt, Jan-Hinrik, Lisa Merten, Uwe Hasebrink, Isabelle Petrich, and Amelie Rolfs. 2019. How do intermediaries shape news-related media repertoires and practices? Findings from a qualitative study. *International Journal of Communication* 13:853–873.

Schmitz Weiss, Amy. 2015. The digital and social media journalist: A comparative analysis of journalists in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Mexico, and Peru. *International Communication Gazette* 77 (1): 74–101. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1748048514556985>.

Schröder, Kim Christian. 2015. News media old and new: Fluctuating audiences, news repertoires and locations of consumption. *Journalism Studies* 16 (1): 60–78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2014.890332>.

Schroeder, Ralph. 2016. The globalization of on-screen sociability: Social media and tethered togetherness. *International Journal of Communication* 10:5626–5643.

Schultz, Friederike, Sonja Utz, and Anja Göritz. 2011. Is the medium the message? Perceptions of and reactions to crisis communication via Twitter, blogs and traditional media. *Public Relations Review* 37 (1): 20–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2010.12.001>.

Schünemann, Wolf J. 2020. Ready for the world? Measuring the (trans-)national quality of political issue publics on Twitter. *Media and Communication* 8 (4): 40–52. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17645/mac.v8i4.3162>.

Scolari, Carlos A. 2009. Transmedia storytelling: Implicit consumers, narrative worlds, and branding in contemporary media production. *International Journal of Communication* 3:586–606.

Scolari, Carlos A. 2012. Media ecology: Exploring the metaphor to expand the theory. *Communication Theory* 22 (2): 204–225. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2012.01404.x>.

Scolari, Carlos A. 2013. Media evolution: Emergence, dominance, survival and extinction in the media ecology. *International Journal of Communication* 7:1418–1441.

- Scolere, Leah, Urszula Pruchniewska, and Brooke Erin Duffy. 2018. Constructing the platform-specific self-brand: The labor of social media promotion. *Social Media + Society* 4 (3): 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305118784768>.
- Seagoe, May V. 1951. Children's television habits and preferences. *The Quarterly of Film, Radio, and Television* 6 (2): 143–153. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1209900>.
- Seidman, Steven A. 2008. *Posters, Propaganda, and Persuasion in Election Campaigns around the World and through History*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Selva, Donatella. 2016. Social television: Audience and political engagement. *Television & New Media* 17 (2): 159–173. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1527476415616192>.
- Seo, Hyunjin, and Robert Faris. 2021. Special section on comparative approaches to mis/disinformation. *International Journal of Communication* 15:1165–1172.
- Shahin, Saif, Junki Nakahara, and Mariana Sánchez. 2021. Black Lives Matter goes global: Connective action meets cultural hybridity in Brazil, India, and Japan. *New Media & Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448211057106>.
- Shane-Simpson, Christina, Adriana Manago, Naomi Gaggi, and Kristen Gillespie-Lynch. 2018. Why do college students prefer Facebook, Twitter, or Instagram? Site affordances, tensions between privacy and self-expression, and implications for social capital. *Computers in Human Behavior* 86:276–288. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.04.041>.
- Shifman, Limor. 2007. Humor in the age of digital reproduction: Continuity and change in internet-based comic texts. *International Journal of Communication* 1:187–209.
- Sibilia, Paula. 2008. *La Intimidación Como Espectáculo*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Siles, Ignacio. 2017. *Networked Selves: Trajectories of Blogging in the United States and France*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Singh, Manish. 2021. Facebook, Twitter, WhatsApp face tougher rules in India. *Tech Crunch*, February 25. <https://techcrunch.com/2021/02/25/india-announces-sweeping-guidelines-for-social-media-on-demand-streaming-firms-and-digital-news-outlets>.
- Sisto, Davide. 2020. *Online Afterlives: Immortality, Memory, and Grief in Digital Culture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Skoric, Marko M., and Nathaniel Poor. 2013. Youth engagement in Singapore: The interplay of social and traditional media. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 57 (2): 187–204. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2013.787076>.
- Skoric, Marko M., Qinfeng Zhu, and Jih-Hsuan Tammy Lin. 2018. What predicts selective avoidance on social media? A study of political unfriending in Hong Kong

- and Taiwan. *American Behavioral Scientist* 62 (8): 1097–1115. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764218764251>.
- Slater, Michael D. 2007. Reinforcing spirals: The mutual influence of media selectivity and media effects and their impact on individual behavior and social identity. *Communication Theory* 17 (3): 281–303. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2007.00296.x>.
- Smoliarova, Anna S., Tamara M. Gromova, and Natalia A. Pavlushkina. 2018. Emotional stimuli in social media user behavior: Emoji reactions on a news media Facebook page. In *International Conference on Internet Science*, 242–256. Cham, Switzerland: Springer International.
- Snell-Hornby, Mary. 1999. Communicating in the global village: On language, translation and cultural identity. *Current Issues in Language & Society* 6 (2): 103–120. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13520529909615539>.
- So, Clement Y. K. 2010. The rise of Asian communication research: A citation study of SSCI journals. *Asian Journal of Communication* 20 (2): 230–247. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01292981003693419>.
- Solaris. 2020. Capítulo once: Viralidad. *Podium Podcast*. <https://www.podiumpodcast.com/podcasts/solaris-podium-os/episodio/3097589/>.
- Sparks, Colin. 2008. Media systems in transition: Poland, Russia, China. *Chinese Journal of Communication* 1 (1): 7–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17544750701861871>.
- Stefanone, Michael A., and Derek Lackaff. 2009. Reality television as a model for online behavior: Blogging, photo, and video sharing. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 14 (4): 964–987. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2009.01477.x>.
- Stefanone, Michael A., Derek Lackaff, and Devan Rosen. 2010. The relationship between traditional mass media and “social media”: Reality television as a model for social network site behavior. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 54 (3): 508–525. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2010.498851>.
- Steinberg, Marc. 2020. LINE as Super App: Platformization in East Asia. *Social Media + Society* 6 (2): 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120933285>.
- Sterne, Jonathan. 2003. *The Audible Past: Cultural Origins of Sound Reproduction*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Stieglitz, Stefan, and Linh Dang-Xuan. 2013. Emotions and information diffusion in social media—Sentiment of microblogs and sharing behavior. *Journal of Management Information Systems* 29 (4): 217–248. <https://doi.org/10.2753/MIS0742-1222290408>.
- Strangelove, Michael. 2010. *Watching YouTube: Extraordinary Videos by Ordinary People*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

- Strate, Lance. 2004. A media ecology review. *Communication Research Trends* 23 (2): 3–48.
- Straubhaar, Joseph D. 2007. *World Television: From Global to Local*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Streeter, Thomas. 2011. *The Net Effect: Romanticism, Capitalism, and the Internet*. New York: New York University Press.
- Su, Chunmeizi. 2019. “Changing dynamics of digital entertainment media in China.” PhD diss., Queensland University of Technology.
- Sumner, Erin M., Rebecca A. Hayes, Caleb T. Carr, and Donghee Yvette Wohn. 2020. Assessing the cognitive and communicative properties of Facebook Reactions and Likes as lightweight feedback cues. *First Monday* 25 (2). <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v25i2.9621>.
- Sundar, S. Shyam. 2008. The MAIN model: A heuristic approach to understanding technology effects on credibility. In *Digital Media, Youth, and Credibility*, edited by Miriam J. Metzger and Andrew J. Flanagin. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Sunstein, Cass R. 2009. *Republic.com 2.0*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sunstein, Cass R. 2017. *#Republic: Divided Democracy in the Age of Social Media*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Susser, Daniel, Beate Roessler, and Helen Nissenbaum. 2019. Technology, autonomy, and manipulation. *Internet Policy Review* 8 (2). <https://doi.org/10.14763/2019.2.1410>.
- Suzina, Ana Cristina. 2021. English as *lingua franca*. Or the sterilisation of scientific work. *Media, Culture & Society* 43 (1): 171–179. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443720957906>.
- Swart, Joëlle, Chris Peters, and Marcel Broersma. 2017. Navigating cross-media news use: Media repertoires and the value of news in everyday life. *Journalism Studies* 18 (11): 1343–1362. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2015.1129285>.
- Syvetsen, Trine. 2017. *Media Resistance Protest, Dislike, Abstention*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer International.
- Tandoc, Edson C., Jr., Chen Lou, and Velyn Lee Hui Min. 2019. Platform-swinging in a poly-social-media context: How and why users navigate multiple social media platforms. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 24 (1): 21–35. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmy022>.
- Taneja, Harsh, James G. Webster, Edward C. Malthouse, and Thomas B. Ksiazek. 2012. Media consumption across platforms: Identifying user-defined repertoires. *New Media & Society* 14 (6): 951–968. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444811436146>.

- Taylor, T. L. 2018. *Watch Me Play: Twitch and the Rise of Game Live Streaming*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tenenboim-Weinblatt, Keren, and Chul-joo Lee. 2020. Speaking across communication subfields. *Journal of Communication* 70 (3): 303–309. <https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqaa012>.
- Teune, Henry, and Adam Przeworski. 1970. *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry*. New York: Wiley-Interscience.
- Theocharis, Yannis, Will Lowe, Jan W. Van Deth, and Gema García-Albacete. 2015. Using Twitter to mobilize protest action: Online mobilization patterns and action repertoires in the Occupy Wall Street, Indignados, and Aganaktismenoi movements. *Information, Communication & Society* 18 (2): 202–220. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2014.948035>.
- Thompson, Emily Ann. 2002. *The Soundscape of Modernity: Architectural Acoustics and the Culture of Listening in America, 1900–1933*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Thorburn, David, and Henry Jenkins. 2003. *Rethinking Media Change: The Aesthetics of Transition*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Thurlow, Crispin. 2018. Digital discourse: Locating language in new/social media. In *The SAGE Handbook of Social Media*, edited by Jean Burgess, Alice E. Marwick, and Thomas Poell, 135–145. Los Angeles: SAGE.
- Thurlow, Crispin, and Kristine Mroczek, eds. 2011. *Digital Discourse: Language in the New Media*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Torkjazi, Mojtaba, Reza Rejaie, and Walter Willinger. 2009. Hot today, gone tomorrow: On the migration of MySpace users. In *Proceedings of the 2nd ACM Workshop on Online Social Networks*, 43–48. New York: ACM. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1592665.1592676>.
- Törnberg, Anton, and Petter Törnberg. 2016. Muslims in social media discourse: Combining topic modeling and critical discourse analysis. *Discourse, Context & Media* 13:132–142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2016.04.003>.
- Trepte, Sabine, Leonard Reinecke, Nicole B. Ellison, Oliver Quiring, Mike Z. Yao, and Marc Ziegele. 2017. A cross-cultural perspective on the privacy calculus. *Social Media + Society* 3 (1): 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305116688035>.
- Trevisan, Filippo. 2020. “Do you want to be a well-informed citizen, or do you want to be sane?”: Social media, disability, mental health, and political marginality. *Social Media + Society* 6 (1): 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120913909>.
- Tufekci, Zeynep. 2014. Big questions for social media big data: Representativeness, validity and other methodological pitfalls. In *Proceedings of the Eighth International*

AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media, 505–514. Palo Alto, CA: The AAAI Press.

Tufekci, Zeynep. 2018. *Twitter and Tear Gas: The Power and Fragility of Networked Protest*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Tufekci, Zeynep, and Christopher Wilson. 2012. Social media and the decision to participate in political protest: Observations from Tahrir Square. *Journal of Communication* 62 (2): 363–379. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2012.01629.x>.

Turner, Fred. 2006. *From Counterculture to Cyberculture: Stewart Brand, the Whole Earth Network, and the Rise of Digital Utopianism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Twenge, Jean M., Thomas E. Joiner, Megan L. Rogers, and Gabrielle N. Martin. 2018. Increases in depressive symptoms, suicide-related outcomes, and suicide rates among U.S. adolescents after 2010 and links to increased new media screen time. *Clinical Psychological Science* 6 (1): 3–17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167702617723376>.

Ullmann, Stefanie. 2017. Conceptualising force in the context of the Arab revolutions: A comparative analysis of international mass media reports and Twitter posts. *Discourse & Communication* 11 (2): 160–178. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1750481317691859>.

Utz, Sonja, Nicole Muscanell, and Cameran Khalid. 2015. Snapchat elicits more jealousy than Facebook: A comparison of Snapchat and Facebook use. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior and Social Networking* 18 (3): 141–146. <https://doi.org/10.1089/cyber.2014.0479>.

Uy-Tioco, Cecilia. 2007. Overseas Filipino workers and text messaging: Reinventing transnational mothering. *Continuum* 21 (2): 253–265. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10304310701269081>.

Vaidhyanathan, Siva. 2018. *Antisocial Media: How Facebook Disconnects Us and Undermines Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Valenzuela, Sebastián, Teresa Correa, and Homero Gil de Zúñiga. 2018. Ties, likes, and tweets: Using strong and weak ties to explain differences in protest participation across Facebook and Twitter use. *Political Communication* 35 (1): 117–134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2017.1334726>.

Valenzuela, Sebastián, Soledad Puente, and Pablo M. Flores. 2017. Comparing disaster news on Twitter and television: An intermedia agenda setting perspective. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 61 (4): 615–637. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2017.1344673>.

van Atteveldt, Wouter, and Tai-Quan Peng. 2018. When communication meets computation: Opportunities, challenges, and pitfalls in computational communication science. *Communication Methods and Measures* 12 (2–3): 81–92. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19312458.2018.1458084>.

- Vanden Abeele, Mariek M. P. 2020. Digital wellbeing as a dynamic construct. *Communication Theory* 31 (4): 932–955. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ct/qtaa024>.
- van Dijck, José. 2013. “You have one identity”: Performing the self on Facebook and LinkedIn. *Media, Culture & Society* 35 (2): 199–215. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443712468605>.
- van Dijck, José. 2014. Datafication, dataism and dataveillance: Big Data between scientific paradigm and ideology. *Surveillance & Society* 12 (2): 197–208. <https://doi.org/10.24908/ss.v12i2.4776>.
- van Dijck, José. 2020. Governing digital societies: Private platforms, public values. *Computer Law and Security Report* 36:105377. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.clsr.2019.105377>.
- van Dijk, Jan. 2006. *The Network Society: Social Aspects of New Media*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Vessey, Rachelle. 2015. Food fight: Conflicting language ideologies in English and French news and social media. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 10 (2): 253–271. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17447143.2015.1042883>.
- Vliengenthart, Rens, and Stefaan Walgrave. 2008. The contingency of intermedia agenda setting: A longitudinal study in Belgium. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 85 (4): 860–877. <https://doi.org/10.1177/107769900808500409>.
- von Nordheim, Gerret, Karin Boczek, Lars Koppers, and Elena Erdmann. 2018. Digital traces in context: Reuniting a divided public? Tracing the TTIP debate on Twitter and in traditional media. *International Journal of Communication* 12:548–569.
- Vraga, Emily K., and Melissa Tully. 2019. Engaging with the other side: Using news media literacy messages to reduce selective exposure and avoidance. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics* 16 (1): 77–86. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19331681.2019.1572565>.
- Wagner, Claudia, Markus Strohmaier, Alexandra Olteanu, Emre Kıcıman, Noshir Contractor, and Tina Eliassi-Rad. 2021. Measuring algorithmically infused societies. *Nature* (London) 595 (7866): 197–204. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03666-1>.
- Waisbord, S. 2019. *Communication: A Post-Discipline*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Waisbord, Silvio. 2020. *El Imperio de la Utopía: Mitos y Realidades de la Sociedad Estadounidense*. Madrid: Ediciones Península.
- Walker, Shawn, Dan Mercea, and Marco Bastos. 2019. The disinformation landscape and the lockdown of social platforms. *Information, Communication & Society* 22 (11): 1531–1543. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2019.1648536>.

- Walter, Nathan, Michael J. Cody, Sandra J. Ball-Rokeach. 2018. The ebb and flow of communication research: Seven decades of publication trends and research priorities. *Journal of Communication* 68 (2): 424–440. <https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqx015>.
- Wartella, Ellen, and Byron Reeves. 1985. Historical trends in research on children and the media: 1900–1960. *Journal of Communication* 35 (2): 118–133. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1985.tb02238.x>.
- Weber, Max. 1949. “Objectivity” in social science and social policy. In *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*, 49–112. New York: Free Press.
- Webster, James G. 2011. The duality of media: A structurational theory of public attention. *Communication Theory* 21 (1): 43–66. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2010.01375.x>.
- Webster, James G., and Jacob J. Wakshlag. 1983. A theory of television program choice. *Communication Research* 10 (4): 430–446. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009365083010004002>.
- Wiemann, John M., Suzanne Pingree, and Robert P. Hawkins. 1988. Fragmentation in the field—and the movement toward integration in communication science. *Human Communication Research* 15 (2): 304–310. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2958.1988.tb00186.x>.
- Willems, Wendy. 2014. Provincializing hegemonic histories of media and communication studies: Toward a genealogy of epistemic resistance in Africa. *Communication Theory* 24 (4): 415–434. <https://doi.org/10.1111/comt.12043>.
- Williams, Frederick, Ronald E. Rice, and Everett M. Rogers. 1988. *Research Methods and the New Media*. New York: Free Press.
- Winner, Langdon. 1980. Do artifacts have politics? *Daedalus* 109 (1): 121–136. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20024652>.
- Wohn, Donghee Y., and Eun-Kyung Na. 2011. Tweeting about TV: Sharing television viewing experiences via social media message streams. *First Monday* 16 (3). <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v16i3.3368>.
- Wolfsfeld, Gadi, Elad Segev, and Tamir Sheaffer. 2013. Social media and the Arab Spring: Politics comes first. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 18 (2): 115–137. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1940161212471716>.
- World Migration Report. 2020. *Geneva: International Organization for Migration*. <https://doi.org/10.18356/b1710e30-en>.
- Wyatt, Sally M. E. 2003. Non-users also matter: The construction of users and non-users of the Internet. In *How Users Matter: The Co-Construction of Users and*

Technologies, edited by Nelly Oudshoorn and Trevor J. Pinch, 67–79. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Yang, JungHwan, Matthew Barnidge, and Hernando Rojas. 2017. The politics of “Unfriending”: User filtration in response to political disagreement on social media. *Computers in Human Behavior* 70:22–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.12.079>.

Yarchi, Moran, Christian Baden, and Neta Kligler-Vilenchik. 2020. Political polarization on the digital sphere: A cross-platform, over-time analysis of interactional, positional, and affective polarization on social media. *Political Communication* 38 (1–2): 98–139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2020.1785067>.

Zarowsky, Mariano. 2017. *Los Estudios en Comunicación en la Argentina: Ideas, Intelectuales, Tradiciones Político-Culturales*. Buenos Aires: Eudeba.

Zelizer, Barbie. 2016. Communication in the fan of disciplines. *Communication Theory* 26 (3): 213–235. <https://doi.org/10.1111/comt.12094>.

Zhao, Luolin, and Nicholas John. 2020. The concept of “sharing” in Chinese social media: Origins, transformations and implications. *Information, Communication & Society* 25 (3): 359–375. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2020.1791216>.

Zhao, Xuan, Cliff Lampe, and Nicole B. Ellison. 2016. The social media ecology: User perceptions, strategies and challenges. In *Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 89–100. New York: Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2858036.2858333>.

Zhou, Yuchen, Mark Dredze, David A. Broniatowski, and William D. Adler. 2019. Elites and foreign actors among the alt-right: The Gab social media platform. *First Monday* 24 (9). <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v24i9.10062>.

Zhu, Qinfeng, Marko Skoric, and Fei Shen. 2017. I shield myself from thee: Selective avoidance on social media during political protests. *Political Communication* 34 (1): 112–131. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10584609.2016.1222471>.

Zuboff, Shoshana. 2019. *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. New York: Public Affairs.