Professor David McGillivray, Chair in Event and Digital Cultures, School of Media, Culture and Society, University of the West of Scotland

(Digital) culture, media citizenship and major event narratives

Abstract

Increasing academic attention has focused on the value of digital media making as a productive, creative, and even political act. Yet, in an age of platform politics the rhetoric of the democratic, open and egalitarian Web has been subject to significant critique for its inherent commercially oriented form and for its control of who and what is said. In this chapter, I explore the role of everyday digital media tools and technologies in enabling a diverse range of publics to tell their own stories in and around major sporting events, focusing on two practice-research project case studies.

Introduction

The Commonwealth Games is major sporting event that takes place every four years. Like its more illustrious counterparts, the Olympic Games and the FIFA World Cup, this event attracts attention from rights-owning media, with broadcasters, print and, increasingly, online media platforms paying handsomely for the privilege of covering the sporting competitions on offer. However, the Games are not simply a sporting extravaganza that celebrates the achievements of elite athletes. Instead, major (and mega) sporting events are now implicated in strategic narratives of legacy (economic, social and cultural) and tasked with leveraging wider objectives for host cities and awarding bodies alike. Moreover, sport events of all sizes and scales are also mediated in various ways, accessed by audiences via multiple platforms that give

more people than ever before the opportunity to make, rather than just consume, media.

In this chapter I explore how the availability of everyday digital tools and technologies enables a broader public to interact with, and create, media content related to major sport events. I focus on the practices and behaviors that emerge around digital developments and that permit (or afford) certain voices to be heard more effectively than was the case when fewer media organizations dominated the reporting of major sporting events. I also identify some of the limitations of deprofessionalized and decapitalized media to produce the material changes hoped for by their proponents. I conclude by discussing how developments in everyday digital practices and platforms require researchers to adopt different research techniques if they are to gain useful insights into media and sporting events, especially as knowledge is being created and circulated in the making of the media artefacts themselves.

Digital disruption: media and major sport events

When we cast an eye back at the highlights of major sports events from the past, the gaze is invariably directed towards television archives, whether of the infamous Ben Johnston disqualification from the 100 meters final in the 1988 Seoul Olympic Games or grainy coverage of Adolf Hitler and Jesse Owens' respective performances at the 1936 Olympic Games in Berlin. As Dayan and Katz (1992) have argued, the Olympics are the archetypal media event, a live broadcast of history, able to "interrupt the rhythm and focus of people's lives" (Dayan & Katz, 1992, p.204). Media events in these terms are exceptional, representing a break from everyday life and broadcast television has been the dominant medium through which audiences experience the Olympic Games as a platform in its own right (Price, 2008). However, over the last two decades, the media landscape of major sporting events has become much more diverse, with the preeminence of television broadcasts being supplemented, and at times, replaced by a range of other ways of accessing and creating content that impacts on event representations. What we now 'know' about major sporting events and their political, social and economic impacts is not restricted to what is broadcast on television by the host broadcaster but also now includes the influence of Youtube

videos, Facebook posts, blog entries and tweets. As Aslan, Dennis and O'Loughlin (2015) suggest, "in an increasingly participatory media ecology…the unfolding of media logic is networked across actors and practices" (p.578). The diversity of actors and practices means that, in aggregate, audiences now watch more sport but they do so across a number of platforms, often simultaneously (Rowe, 2014). Another outcome of the proliferation of platforms (Gillespie, 2010) on which to produce, upload and share content is that for those trying to present a coherent event narrative there are many more plates to spin and leaks to plug.

In recent years, we have witnessed not only the introduction of a new set of technologies for viewing the action taking place at and around major sport events (e.g. smartphones, Virtual Reality headsets and 3D televisions) but also a new set of social and cultural practices accompanying them. Established media power brokers (e.g. rights owning broadcasters) are also becoming more adept at incorporating the 'social' into their activities and monetizing newer media platforms more effectively (Aslan et al., 2015). So, traditional players are incorporating emerging platforms into their existing media conglomerates in order to enhance audience involvement and participation – and to maximize profits. As Burchell (2015) has suggested:

> Sports media has been steadily commercialising online. Social network interactions compliment and extend their broadcasting coverage…the International Olympic Committee (IOC) and media partners have attempted to both accommodate challenges from and harness the potential of blogging, online streaming, video-blogging and mobile viewing at successive Olympics" (p.661)

It is this fragile balance of power between established players and an increasingly networked public that makes the media landscape around these events so interesting. In the field of sport events there are significant restrictions placed on media artefacts because of the commercial imperatives that abound. Even the most innocent user of social networks or online forums can fall foul of the tightly controlled communication regulations associated with the licensing of sporting events. Sponsors, sanctioning bodies, host governments and other private sector actors tightly regulate the narratives flowing from these events, with an "extended and militarized media infrastructure for

constructing and protecting the global narrative" (Burchell, 2015, p.659). As a result, the story of the Games is often scripted, especially as event (and media) platforms are controlled to avoid what Price (2008) has called 'hijacking' from taking place. However, as a result, there is a real danger that an extremely sanitized and prescribed media story emerges, despite the rhetoric of a multi-platform, diverse media landscape where people choose when and where to consume and with which device. In other words, the power still resides with the major event bodies, albeit "in a social media age, this power is more contingent and dispersed" (Aslan et al, 2015, p.581).

Yet, there are also counter arguments suggesting a possible transfer of power from producer to produser (Bruns, 2008) or prosumer (Ritzer & Jurgenson, 2010) that is worthy of attention here. Complex entanglements exist between different media channels in a multi-platform age. Even the powerful broadcast media cannot ignore the immediacy of social media as one space impacts the other in complex and uncertain ways, before and during major sporting events. The producer and prosumer spheres interact and inform each other so what we 'know' about these events is no longer simply the product of a carefully-crafted and controlled corporate-media complex at work. Partly, this is the result of changes in cultural production.

Until the early 2000s the means of media production were in the hands of the few, and control of intended narratives was easier. In the latter part of the 20th and early 21st century the growth in availability of mobile devices including laptops, tablets and smartphones has afforded more people the opportunity to 'make' and not simply 'consume' media. Atton (2014) has argued for the deprofessionalization and decapitalization of media to enable its democratic function to be realised. The argument goes that the citizen witness (Allan, 2013) can stumble across a story (whether relating to sport or other news worthy topics) and, using their personal communication device, circulate it within seconds to a potentially large audience. The media that these citizen witnesses produce may not be carefully crafted or viewed as having intrinsic news value, but the impact can be significant when communicated with a networked public. Citizens have always been able to witness events, but it is the mass availability of media production devices in the hands, or pockets, of so many that makes the possibilities afforded to them today different.

Major sport events are regularly derided for their extravagance and for focusing on the needs of the event to the cost of other priorities in the host nation (Muller, 2015). There is also evidence that they are used by pro-growth business and political coalitions to enshrine new uses of public space, including laws that enable certain practices whilst constraining others (Zimbalist, 2015; Smith, 2015). And yet, common to every recent major (and mega) sport event is the presence of oppositional groups that use the democratic potential of the web to organize, mobilize and garner attention for their cause. Events taking place within the confines of a host city can be transmitted to an audience of millions via social media, altering perceptions and potentially impacting negatively on the profitable event brand. Just consider for a moment the negative international reaction that the Gulf State of Qatar is currently experiencing as a result of claims about corruption and poor human rights practices as they prepare to host the 2022 World Cup Finals. Qatar had hoped to use its hosting of the world's second largest sporting event to gain soft power but already commentators are forecasting that instead they may experience soft disempowerment (Brannagan & Giulianotti, 2015) as a result of the intensive media attention on largely negative stories. More recently still, those against the idea of Boston hosting the 2024 Olympic Games effectively used web channels and social media to reach out to the general public, contesting mainstream media stories about the 'benefits' of the Games to the citizenry (Lauermann, 2016). In this example, we saw a significant proportion of the general public become more informed about the potential costs to taxpayers of underwriting an Olympic bid, resulting in pressure upon politicians in that city to withdraw from the bidding race. However, just as media power lay in the hands of a few influential owners, so there are also questions to be asked about how democratic and participatory these other forms of media are – and with what impact. It is to this question the focus of the discussion now turns.

The limits of 'critical digital citizenship'

It is important to recognise and reflect upon the potentially problematic nature of the idea of citizen movements coming together as part of a networked public to oppose or protest against what they view as the extravagance of major sporting events. As Shaw (2008) and Lenskyj (2010) have both highlighted, it is one thing to mobilize support, organize protests and seek action via independent or alternative media activities

around the Olympic Games, for example, but it is quite another to turn disruption into material social change. Whereas, there appear to be fewer impediments in place for silenced voices to be heard, there are political, economic and cultural reasons why the impact of these may not be as significant as intended, or desired. First, the resources that those promoting events have at their disposal significantly outweigh those opposing the major event spectacle. These resources are not simply monetary, but also include access to political influence, private benefactors and, crucially for this chapter, media outlets. These 'boosters' are in a position to 'frame' the terms of the debate with the help of public relations organizations and their access to prime time media. Second, the opportunity to express opposition or promote an alternative cause before and during a major sporting event is also increasingly limited, partly due to the increasing securitization of urban civic space that has accompanied major sport event hosting (Jennings, 2010) and also because the "contemporary media event platform" (Burchell, 2015, p.663) has enabled media professionals working with host organizers to curtail opportunities for public protest.

Third, it would be naïve to assume that, just because the tools are available to produce, create and circulate media content, these practices are freely chosen or equitably distributed. Gillespie (2010) has offered a critique of the 'apparently' free and democratic space of Web 2.0 and argued that the platforms that have become commonplace are inseparable from the profit motive. Corporate social media is big business and users are contributing to the profits of companies like Google, Twitter and Facebook as they 'freely' produce and upload their content (Fuchs, 2014). These critics not only draw attention to the exploitative economic arrangements enshrined within newer forms of media but also decry the way that the established media uses these platforms as simply another outlet to control the dominant narrative. This perspective is given substance by Aslan et al (2015) who confirm that, despite the rise of social media (and some positive impacts), "media organisations have learnt to integrate social media to remain primary gatekeepers of media events" (p. 597). Partly, media organizations have been able to remain primary gatekeepers because they have been able to borrow from the liberatory principles of new media in its early days - the idea of engagement, participation, involvement and sharing - and incorporate these into their own strategic goals.

Bengtsson (2015) suggests that socio-economic status is an important predictor of how "people incorporate the internet in their everyday lives" (p.32) and argues that those in possession of capital (cultural) use the internet to enhance their knowledge bank, searching for information and acquiring new knowledge. On the other hand, "less capital-strong users do not benefit from their internet use in the same way" (p.32). Digital and social media use varies according to users *habitus*, their existing offline cultural tastes and preferences, but this is not consistent or uncontested. We should not presume, in the new participatory media ecology, that access and use are evenly available to all. To the contrary, access to digital and social media platforms is differential. Danielsson (2011) has argued that "even if digital media carry the potential of greater equality, we cannot confuse the potential with the real" (p.58) and "it is also a matter of *how* you engage with digital media…agents must be productive and professional when using digital media, at least if they are to use them in the social and symbolic struggles over capital" (p.65). These comments are important because they offer a cautionary tale to those presuming that the digital necessarily offers a democratic and more inclusive access to politics and civic life. Instead, we need to acknowledge that the same inequalities of access to, and use of, capital (economic, cultural and social) may also exist in the digital sphere.

Moreover, just because digital platforms are available and readily used by significant parts of the population that does not necessarily mean that people are comfortable or confident users, able to seamlessly navigate their way through a complex environment, safely, whilst being empowered to make their voices heard effectively. As Willig, Waltorp and Hartley (2015) stress, "the link between cultural capital, habitus and cultural form produces a socially entrenched digital inequality rather than an economically entrenched digital divide (p.5). Danielsson (2011) further states that, "the potential for using the internet for the production and publication of digital content is more thoroughly realised by the privileged" (p.68). As I have argued elsewhere, if the hopes and aspirations of those emphasizing the possibilities of digital platforms are to be realized then there is a need to ensure that *critical digital citizenship* is enshrined in formal and informal learning settings so that people are asked to "ponder how digitally mediated publics operate and think carefully about matters of ownership, privacy, security and risk" (McGillivray, McPherson, Jones & McCandlish, 2015, p.13). It is imperative that people are media literate if they are to

effectively exploit the opportunities presented by an apparently more democratic media environment to create, rather than just consume, content. Young people in particular are often viewed as being able to navigate the digitally-enabled world with ease, choosing to post content to multiple platforms, whilst at the same time curating an online identity that reflects the way they would like to be represented. However, there is ample evidence that perhaps impressions are not borne out in practice, with Johnson, Adams Becker, Estrada, Freeman, Kampylis, Vuorikari and Punie (2014) arguing that:

> levels of digital competence in children and teenagers remain inadequate, especially on the dimensions of critical and participatory literacy, where students do not just read content, but also engage with it and actively create their own responses to it" (p.26).

It is this focus on critical and participatory literacy that was at the heart of the two case studies I now explore, focusing on major sport events, but concerned with broader processes of digital citizenship.

Democratizing digital media: two cases

The cases I now explore are less about deprofessionalization and democratization and more about understanding the way the social web operates, accepting its limits whilst exploiting its strengths. Along with colleagues (see McGillivray & Jones, 2013; Frew & McGillivray, 2014) in recent years I have been involved in research that focuses *on* sport events but is not *about* these events *per se*. In 2012, I led a research-practice project *#citizenrelay* that worked with non-professional media producers to cover the London 2012 Olympic Torch Relay as it travelled the length and breadth of Scotland. This project took advantage of the growth in ownership of mobile smartphone and tablet devices and the networked possibilities enabled by social media to develop a mediated public response to the event. Working with around 60 citizen reporters and hundreds of other online 'participants' (in the sense that they shared photos and blog posts with the project hashtag), the project sought to co-create media in non-traditional settings, including libraries, coffee shops, community halls and restaurants working on the basis that, "such media will then have the potential to more closely

reflect the everyday practices of decentralized, directly democratic, self-managed and reflexive networks" (Atton, 2014, p.343). The *#citizenrelay* project was also about amplifying, and surfacing, less visible aspects of everyday cultural production, with a commitment that:

> participation includes doing and making as well as consuming. Conceptualizing creative citizenship needs to be alive to how consumption, plus 'microproductive' DIY creation, plus mediated association (doing it with others – DIWO) via digital and social media networks, are mutually emergent, working together (Hargreaves, 2016, p.42).

The *#citizenrelay* project enshrined Hargreaves' ideas about DIY and DIWO and mobilized non-professional media makers to create and share content about a major sporting event spectacle. Over the course of a week in 2012 hundreds of videos, short audio interviews, photographs and blog posts were uploaded to the project's web platform which secured over 20 000 hits and attracted significant mainstream media coverage. The project was promoted by the BBC as an exemplar of local stories about the torch's journey. *#citizenrelay* also addressed the issues associated with possession of economic and cultural capital identified by Danielsson (2011), Willig et al (2015) and Bengtsson (2015). It was built on a low budget, with inexpensive technology, focusing more on the possibilities presented by new tools and technologies to enable people to tell their locally produced stories and share them with a national audience. It emphasized a set of core principles and practices associated with sharing, collaborating and networking in favor of investment in technical infrastructures and professional standard equipment. However, whilst participants in *#citizenrelay* were able to *make* and *do*, they would have benefitted from also being able to call on a wider support network to help them reflect, learn and adapt their practice in the longer term. Digital literacies are not learned overnight and need to be sustained through education and practice over a longer time period often not built into one-off funded projects. Whilst successful in meeting its core objectives *#citizenrelay* needed to learn from the principles of community development to ensure sustainable outcomes.

Out of this learning, the *Digital Commonwealth* project was established. This project, funded by a charitable organization, sought to use digital media as a vehicle to

facilitate a creative response to the Commonwealth Games in Glasgow 2014 involving a diverse range of participants often poorly represented in mainstream media, including those living in areas of socio-economic deprivation, young people, older adults, people with a disability and minority ethnic groups. The project had four main components: (1) a *community media* strand; (3) *creative voices* (songwriting, film and creative writing); (2) *#citizen2014*, a Games-time newswire; and (4) a *schools programme* delivered in collaboration with 23 local authority areas across Scotland. Finally, all content produced was brought into one space in the form of a bespoke web platform with embedded social media channels (www.digitalcommonwealth.co.uk). At the core of *Digital Commonwealth* was its conception as an action-focused, practice-research project, which drew on the insights garnered from *making* (audio, video, blogs) and *doing* (delivering workshops) to embed digital media literacies in some of the most marginalized communities in Scotland. One of the project's principal outputs was a *Handbook of Digital Storytelling* produced collaboratively with project trainers, participants and other partners including the charity Media Trust. When delivering digital media projects it is tempting to simply produce artefacts without unpacking how this media is made, where it will be hosted and how an external audience receives it. However, with *Digital Commonwealth* a key aim was to make media using the devices that many of us have in our pockets whilst also learning, by stealth, about 'digital' literacies and associated digital rights. These rights include privacy, ownership of data and the right to remove.

The *Digital Commonwealth* project engaged people often perceived to be on the margins of society to create media content, using ideas connected to the Commonwealth Games - but not necessarily connected to sport. We asked groups and individuals to work within the framework of four themes – people, place, culture and exchange. Some projects focused on the links to the Commonwealth in their area, whether through place names or famous people. Others emphasized the cultural links between Scotland and other Commonwealth nations or used digital skills to arrange live interviews with athletes from other countries. Those island communities involved in the project invariably linked and co-created blogs, audio or videos with other small Commonwealth islands. Collaboratively, nearly 600 school pupils produced digital media artefacts whilst 100 people wrote songs, produced films and penned poems and

other creative writing outputs. Partner organizations committed to helping communities to produce their own stories whilst developing valuable long-term skills and competencies. Others came together during the project to produce Games-time reporting of social and cultural themes not well covered in the sport media, including providing an insight into the lives of people affected by developments in Glasgow's East End.

As we reflected on the process, output and outcomes of the *Digital Commonwealth,* we became even more aware of the significant complexities involved in making media with non-professionals. These complexities include dealing with participant fears over the implications of being 'public' and the paucity of 'resources' (economic, cultural and social) communities have in their possession when it comes to media. In more marginalized communities, the situated knowledge that exists is rarely articulated, especially via the mainstream media, other than in sensationalist terms. However, we found and unearthed powerful life narratives, personal biopics and collective memories that were given space within the *Digital Commonwealth* when they might otherwise not have been heard. However, in order for these practices to be sustained, there is a need for ongoing support to ensure that the production of media artefacts about, say, a major sport event is not de-contextualized from the realities of people's lives.

The *Digital Commonwealth* project was not simply about the here and now - what others have called the 'event media arc' or during Games time. Instead, there is a different sort of legacy media produced that extends beyond the temporal limitations of Games-time where media activity is at its peak. The *Digital Commonwealth* project sought to provide a range of non-professionals with the opportunity to learn about critical digital citizenship in order to better understand how to operate effectively in the diverse, multi-platform digital media age we are living through. The intention was to ensure that the skills and competences gained would not simply enable participants to generate their own media artefacts to comment on the Commonwealth Games, but rather to become informed creators and co-producers of media in order to continue to benefit themselves and their communities in the future. Learning how to differentiate between types of media, ownership of media content, privacy, confidentiality, legality and the like are more important, in my view, than simply consuming media content or

producing content for broadcast media without recognizing its provenance or final destination. Only in this way, can we materialize the notion that "technological potential is no longer solely the domain of broadcasters: activists, citizens and spectators now have the tools to potentially sustain and/or mobilize public sentiment" (Burchell, 2015, p. 661). Success is difficult to assess, but what we do know is that many of the partners involved in *Digital Commonwealth* continue to interact with each other and with the researchers involved. They continue to make media and have it shared on their own, or others', platforms. And they, increasingly, seek to support other community members to get involved in this form of cultural production, often for social and civic reasons rather than for any commercial benefit.

Practice-research: co-production, creativity and ethics

As this book is concerned with qualitative digital research, in this final part of this chapter it is important to reflect on the projects I have discussed from a research perspective, including the implications for epistemology, methodology and methods, as they relate to my interest – major sport events. The researchers involved in *Digital Commonwealth* were active participants in the project rather than looking in from afar, in keeping with the practice of co-production. The project was concerned with the "production of knowledge through the formation of equal partnerships between academic researchers, practitioners and communities" (Green, Sobers, Zamenopoulos, Chapain & Turner, 2016, p.155). Moreover, we were engaged in "developing knowledge…based on experiential learning, reflective practice or participatory action research" (p.155). For some, the positioning of the researcher as both a producer and curator of content is problematic. However, for both *#citizenrelay* and *Digital Commonwealth* the embedded practice-researcher position helped to form trust with the participants and creative practitioners involved in the project. Within a digital context, working with others to produce and upload digital media enabled knowledge artefacts to be created, presented and networked – opened up discussion, dialogue, re-mixing and re-mediation. The knowledge co-produced was (and continues to be) context-specific and open to temporal and spatial difference. Furthermore, whilst research dissemination is often considered a post-delivery imperative, the approach of *Digital Commonwealth* drew on action research approaches in the way outputs and outcomes informed, and were informed by, partners. The project team penned blog

posts, used collaborative document sharing and presented their insights to a range of participant, policy and academic 'publics'. Working with co-producers, initial project ideas were subject to development and revision, achieved with openness to adaptation and change. In co-produced research, the 'process' is often as important as the 'outcomes' – working with non-specialists media makers, this mantra also applies.

When working in a practice context, employing co-production methodologies, ethical questions are always to the fore. The practice-researcher, working to create and communicate digital media artefacts with community partners, faces difficult questions about which stories to tell, whom to profile and with what short or longer-term impacts. As Green et al. (2016) suggest there is the added "difficulty in attaining equal partnerships between researchers and community partners when one party is being paid and the other not" (p.167). Telling other people's stories about or around a major sporting event also has a temporal dimension. The immediacy of digital and social media platforms means that content can be shared widely, become visible to imagined audiences and lose intended meaning from the original text. These issues are even more important once you consider the practices associated with archiving. All projects experience time lapse and potential difficulties of participant withdrawal as they consider what happens with content produced at a particular time with a specific agenda in mind. From a research perspective it is not easy to locate practice-focused projects in the ethical approval processes common in academic environments. To ensure that the *Digital Commonwealth* project adhered to the tenets of co-production the research team set out to enshrine good practice in a set of commitments including active communication around its guiding principles alongside clear and transparent terms and conditions governing uploading of content. At no point however, did the team underplay the inevitable 'temporal' and 'fragile' status of user consent.

Pink, Horst, Postill, Hjorth, Lewis and Tacchi (2015) provide a summary of the features of digital ethnography which is useful when articulating the approach taken to the *Digital Commonwealth* project and for future research around sport events from the perspective of non-sporting actors and interests. As they acknowledge, it is important to avoid the temptation to see all digital ethnographic practices as having to be facilitated by digital research methods. Instead, they argue, "digital ethnography

research methods should be non-digital-centric. This means that the digital ethnography project should not be prefaced by the idea of needing to use digital methods" (p.10). I agree with these sentiments and argue that to identify grassroots, local and community-focused narratives, research needs to extend beyond the digital to work with, and alongside, people. Research is often viewed as objective, detached, neutral, distant, with the emphasis on finding the right tools to unearth a singular truth. However, this approach can be unsatisfactory in try to reach understanding or access knowledge-making practices. Practice-research approaches like those detailed here can effectively draw out complex 'insights' about a cultural practice, albeit not unproblematically. What we 'know' about sport events and their impacts when using conventional tools can be limited. Other insights may arise from thinking more carefully about how 'practice' knowledge is made visible and brought into the world and given legitimacy or credibility through its mediation or re-mediation. In the *Digital Commonwealth* project rich narratives were produced and given a platform that are often given little space or attention during major sport events where the focus tends to fall on sporting achievement. Finally, for the sort of work I have discussed in this chapter, there is also a need for more embedded, co-produced efforts that re-imagine the researcher and the communities he/she works with as partners in the research endeavor. Whilst co-production activities should not be viewed as solving the issues associated with the power differential between researcher and researched, they do at least provide a way of more effectively involving people in the design and undertaking of research (Green et al., 2016). Looking forward, I hope that those interested in qualitative research in sport, and related areas, look to undertake more co-produced work, in the process contributing to the bank of knowledge around good ethical practice, researcher-community protocols and creative methods for sharing outputs and outcomes.

References

Allan, S. (2013). *Citizen Witnessing: Revisioning Journalism in Times of Crisis*. Oxford: Wiley.

Aslan, B., Dennis, J and O'Loughlin, B. (2015). Balding goes trolling? Cross-media amplification of controversy at the 2012 Olympics, *Participations: Journal of Audience and Reception Studies*, 12 (1), 577-606.

Atton, C. (2014). Alternative Media, the Mundane and "Everyday Citizenship". In M. Ratto and M. Boler (eds.) *DIY Citizenship: Critical Making and Social Media* (343-358). Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Bengtsson, S. (2015). Digital distinctions: mechanisms of difference in digital media use, *MedieKultur*, 58, 30-48.

Brannagan, P. and Giulianotti, R. (2015). Soft power and soft disempowerment: Qatar, global sport and football's 2022 World Cup finals, *Leisure Studies*, 34 (6), 703-719, 10.1080/02614367.2014.964291.

Bruns, A. (2008). *Blogs, Wikipedia, Second Life and Beyond: From Production to Produsage*. New York: Peter Lang.

Burchell, K. (2015). Infiltrating the space, hijacking the platform: Pussy riot, Sochi protests and media events, *Participations: Journal of Audience and Reception Studies*, 12 (1), 659-676.

Danielsson, M. (2011) Digital media as classified and classifying: The case of young men in Sweden, *PLATFORM: Journal of Media and Communication* ECREA Special Issue (November), 57–71

Dayan, D., and Katz. E. (1992). *Media Events: The Live Broadcasting of History*. Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Fuchs, C. (2014). *Social Media: A Critical Introduction*. London: Sage

Gillespie, T. (2010). The politics of 'platforms', *New Media & Society*, 12 (3), 347-364.

Green, C, Sobers, S, Zamenopoulos, T, Chapain, C and Turner, J. (2016). Conversations about co-production. In J. Hargreaves, and J. Hartley (eds). *The Creative Citizen Unbound: how social media and DIY culture contribute to democracy, communities and the creative economy*. Bristol: Policy Press (153-180)

Hands, J. (2013). Introduction: Politics, Power and 'Platformativity', *Culture Machine*, 14, 1-9
Retrieved from http://culturemachine.net/index.php/cm/article/view/504/519

Hargreaves, J. (2016) A problem of knowledge – solved. In J. Hargreaves and J. Hartley (eds). *The Creative Citizen Unbound: how social media and DIY culture contribute to democracy, communities and the creative economy*. Bristol: Policy Press (25-48).

Jenkins, H., Ford, S and Green, J. (2013). *Spreadable Media: Creating Value and Meaning in a Networked Culture*. New York: New York University Press.

Jennings, W. (2010). Governing the Games in an age of uncertainty: The Olympics and organisational responses to risk. In A. Richards., P. Fussey., and A. Silke. (eds) *Terrorism and the Olympics: Major event security and lessons for the future* (135-162), London: Routledge.

Johnson, L., Adams Becker, S., Estrada, V., Freeman, A., Kampylis, P., Vuorikari, R., and Punie, Y. (2014). *Horizon Report Europe: 2014 Schools Edition*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, & Austin, Texas: The New Media Consortium

Lauermann, J. (2016). Boston's Olympic bid and the evolving urban politics of event-led development, *Urban Geographies*, 37 (2), 313-321.

Lenskyj, H. (2010). Olympic impacts on bid and host cities. In V. Girginov (Ed.) *The Olympics: A Critical Reader*. London: Routledge.

Lockton, D., Greene, C., Casey, A., Raby, E., and Vickress, A. (eds.) (2014). *Creative Citizens' Variety Pack: Inspiring digital ideas from community projects.* London: Royal College of Art/

McGillivray, D. and Jones, J. (2013). Events and Resistance, In R.Finkel., D. McGillivray., G. McPherson and P. Robinson (eds). *Research Themes for Events*, Oxon: CABI

McGillivray, D. (2014). Digital cultures, acceleration and mega sporting event narratives, *Leisure Studies*, 33 (1), 96-109, DOI: 10.1080/02614367.2013.841747.

McGillivray, D., McPherson, G., Jones, J and McCandlish, A. (2015). Young people, digital media making and critical digital citizenship, *Leisure Studies*, http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/02614367.2015.1062041.

Muller, M. (2015). The mega-event syndrome: why so much goes wrong in mega-event planning and what to do about it. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 81 (1), 6–17.

Pink, S., Horst, H., Postill, J., Hjorth, L, Lewis, T and Tacchi, J. (2015). Ethnography in a Digital World, *Digital Ethnography: Principles and Practice,* London: Sage.

Price, M. (2008). On seizing the Olympic platform. In M.E. Price and D. Dayan (eds.) *Owning the Olympics: Narratives of the new China* (86-114). Michigan: Digitalculturebooks.

Ratto, M. and Boler, M. (2014). Introduction. In M. Ratto and M. Boler (eds.) *DIY Citizenship: Critical Making and Social Media* (1-22). Cambridge Massachusetts: MIT Press

Ritzer, G. and Jurgenson, N. (2010). Production, Consumption, Prosumption: The nature of capitalism in the age of the digital 'prosumer'', *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 10 (1), 13-36.

Rowe, D. (2014). New screen action and its memories: The "Live" performance of mediated sport fandom, *Television & New Media*, 15(8), 752–759.

Shaw, C.A. (2008). *Five Ring Circus: Myths and Realities of the Olympic Games*, BC, New Society Publishers.

Smith, A. (2015). *Events in the City: Using Public Spaces as Event Venues*, London: Routledge.

Willig, I., Waltorp, K., and Hartley, J.M. (2015) Field Theory approaches to new media practices: An introduction and some theoretical considerations, *MedieKultur*, 58, 1-12.

Zimbalist, A. (2015). *Circus Maximus: The economic gamble behind hosting the Olympics and the World Cup*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.