Creative Audiences MS2004

This module examines new and key developments in audience research and considers the cultural, social and economic significance of 'the audience.' The module will explore how the concept of the audience has shifted over time, and how the vulnerable 'dupes' of the early mass audience became today's digital 'prosumers.' In doing so, it will provide students with an understanding of different theoretical approaches to the creativity of audiences, and a critical perspective on the ways that audiences have been denigrated, feared, courted, and celebrated over time. What do these changing notions of the audience tell us about the influence of the media and the complex relationship between producers and consumers? More broadly, in an age of digital media and increasing personalisation and individualisation of media content, can 'the audience' still be seen to exist?

1

Livingstone S. The changing nature of audiences : from the mass audience to the interactive media user - LSE Research Online. Published Online First: 2003.

2

Highmore B. 'Absentminded Media'. Ordinary lives: studies in the everyday. London: Routledge 2011:114–38.

3

Livingstone S. On the continuing problems of media effects research - LSE Research Online. 1996. http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/21503/

4

Humphreys S. Productive Players: Online Computer Games' Challenge to Conventional Media Forms. Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies. 2005;2:37–51. doi: 10.1080/14791420042000332116

5

Whitehouse-Hart J. Psychosocial explorations of film and television viewing: ordinary audience. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan 2014.

6

Whitehouse-Hart J. Psychosocial explorations of film and television viewing: ordinary audience. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan 2014.

7

Kearney MC. 'Grrrl Zines: Exploring Identity, Transforming Girls' Written Culture'. Girls make media. New York: Routledge 2006:135–87.

8

Wood H. The mediated conversational floor: an interactive approach to audience reception analysis. Media, Culture & Society. 2007;29:75–103. doi: 10.1177/0163443706072000

9

Das R. Converging perspectives in audience studies and digital literacies: Youthful interpretations of an online genre. European Journal of Communication. 2011;26:343–60. doi: 10.1177/0267323111423379

10

Butsch R, Livingstone SM. Meanings of audiences: comparative discourses. Abingdon: Routledge 2014.

11

various. Rethinking the Media Audience: The New Agenda. 1999.

12

Brooker W, Jermyn D. The audience studies reader. London: Routledge 2003.

13

Dickinson R, Linne O, Harindranath R. Approaches to audiences: a reader. London: Arnold 1998.

14

Gauntlett D. Moving experiences: understanding television's influences and effects. London: John Libbey 1995.

15

McQuail D. McQuail's mass communication theory. 6th ed. Los Angeles, Calif: SAGE 2010.

16

Andrew Ruddock. Understanding Audiences: Theory and Method. SAGE 2001.

17

Benjamin W, Arendt H. Illuminations. London: Pimlico 1999.

18

Benjamin W, Tiedemann R. The Arcades Project. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press 1999.

19

Recommended: application of theory of reception as distraction.

20

Livingstone S. On the continuing problems of media effects research - LSE Research Online. 1996. http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/21503/

21

Dickinson R, Linne O, Harindranath R. Approaches to audiences: a reader. London: Arnold 1998.

22

O'Neill B. Media Effects in Context. The handbook of media audiences. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell 2011:320–39.

23

David Gauntlett - Ten things wrong with the media 'effects' model. http://www.theory.org.uk/david/effects.htm

24

Morgan M, Shanahan J. The State of Cultivation. Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media. 2010;54:337–55. doi: 10.1080/08838151003735018

25

Potter WJ. A Critical Analysis of Cultivation Theory. Journal of Communication. 2014;64:1015–36. doi: 10.1111/jcom.12128

26

Gerbner G. Cultivation Analysis: An Overview. Mass Communication and Society. 1998;1:175–94. doi: 10.1080/15205436.1998.9677855

27

Bandura A. Influence of models' reinforcement contingencies on the acquisition of imitative responses. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 1965;1:589–95. doi: 10.1037/h0022070

28

Humphreys S. Productive Players: Online Computer Games' Challenge to Conventional Media Forms. Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies. 2005;2:37–51. doi: 10.1080/1479142042000332116

29

van Dijck J. Users like you? Theorizing agency in user-generated content. Media, Culture & Society. 2009;31:41–58. doi: 10.1177/0163443708098245

30

Whitehouse-Hart J. Psychosocial explorations of film and television viewing: ordinary audience. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan 2014.

31

Seiter E. Making distinctions in TV audience research: Case study of a troubling interview. Cultural Studies. 1990;4:61–84. doi: 10.1080/09502389000490051

32

Ortega Breton H. A psycho-cultural approach to radio listening and creative production. Radio Journal:International Studies in Broadcast & Audio Media. 2013;11:75–90. doi: 10.1386/rjao.11.1.75_1

33

On Not Being a Fan: Masculine Identity, DVD Culture and the Accidental Collector | Bainbridge | Wide Screen. http://widescreenjournal.org/index.php/journal/article/view/41

34

Jensen T. "Watching with my hands over my eyes": Shame and irritation in ambivalent encounters with 'Bad Mothers'. http://www.radicalpsychology.org/vol9-2/jensen.html

35

Recommended Sources / Reading.

36

Stephen F, Lisa B. Psychoanalysis and Psychosocial Studies. Psychoanalysis Culture and Society. 2008;13:346–65.

37

Whitehouse-Hart J. Psychosocial explorations of film and television viewing: ordinary audience. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan 2014.

38

Seiter E. Making distinctions in TV audience research: Case study of a troubling interview. Cultural Studies. 1990;4:61–84. doi: 10.1080/09502389000490051

39

Jensen T. "Watching with my hands over my eyes": Shame and irritation in ambivalent encounters with 'Bad Mothers'. http://www.radicalpsychology.org/vol9-2/jensen.html

40

Chabot Davis K. An Ethnography of Political Identification: The Birmingham School Meets Psychoanalytic Theory. doi: 10.1353/psy.2003.0009

41

various - collection. The gender and media reader. London: Routledge 2011.

42

Rosenbaum, m. Psychosomatics. ;39.

43

Hine C. Towards ethnography of television on the internet: A mobile strategy for exploring mundane interpretive activities. Media, Culture & Society. 2011;33:567–82. doi: 10.1177/0163443711401940

44

Moores S. Interpreting audiences: the ethnography of media consumption. London: Sage Publications 1993.

45

Buckingham D. `Creative' visual methods in media research: possibilities, problems and proposals. Media, Culture & Society. 2009;31:633–52. doi: 10.1177/0163443709335280

46

Kearney MC. 'Grrrl Zines: Exploring Identity, Transforming Girls' Written Culture'. Girls make media. New York: Routledge 2006:135–87.

47

Banet-Weiser S. 'Branding the Post-Feminist Self: Girls' Video Production and YouTube'. Mediated girlhoods: new explorations of girls' media culture. New York: Peter Lang 2011:277–94.

48

Wood H. The mediated conversational floor: an interactive approach to audience reception analysis. Media, Culture & Society. 2007;29:75–103. doi: 10.1177/0163443706072000

49

Jensen T. "Watching with my hands over my eyes": Shame and irritation in ambivalent encounters with 'Bad Mothers'. http://www.radicalpsychology.org/vol9-2/jensen.html

50

Wood H. Television is Happening: Methodological Considerations for Capturing Digital Television Reception". 2007;10:485–506.

51

Gorton K. Media audiences: television, meaning and emotion. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press 2009.

52

Das R. Converging perspectives in audience studies and digital literacies: Youthful interpretations of an online genre. European Journal of Communication. 2011;26:343–60. doi: 10.1177/0267323111423379

53

Livingstone S, Das R. The End of Audiences? Theoretical Echoes of Reception amid the Uncertainties of Use.
http://www.lse.ac.uk/media@lse/WhosWho/AcademicStaff/SoniaLivingstone/pdf/Livingstone-and-Das,-manuscript.pdf

54

Madianou M, Miller D. Polymedia: Towards a new theory of digital media in interpersonal communication. International Journal of Cultural Studies. 2013;16:169–87. doi: 10.1177/1367877912452486

55

Livingstone S. The Challenge of Changing Audiences: Or, What is the Audience Researcher to do in the Age of the Internet? European Journal of Communication. 2004;19:75–86. doi: 10.1177/0267323104040695

56

Das R. Meaning at the Interface: New Genres, New Modes of Interpretative Engagement? The Communication Review. 2010;13:140–59. doi: 10.1080/10714421003795535

57

Are We All Produsers Now?

58

Rosenbaum, m. Psychosomatics. ;39.

59

Rosenbaum, m. Psychosomatics. ;39.