

The Handbook of  
**New Media**  
Updated Student Edition



Edited by Leah A. Lievrouw and  
Sonia Livingstone



HANDBOOK  
*of*  
NEW MEDIA

## **INTERNATIONAL ADVISORY BOARD, FIRST EDITION**

Enrique Bustamante, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Spain  
Richard Collins, Open University, UK  
Brenda Dervin, Ohio State University, USA  
William H. Dutton, University of Oxford, USA  
Patrice Flichy, Université Marne la Vallée, France  
Anthony Giddens, London School of Economics and Political Science, UK  
Cees Hamelink, University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands  
Youichi Ito, Keio University, Japan  
Elizabeth Jacka, University of Technology, Sydney, Australia  
Eddie C. Y. Kuo, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore  
Donald Lamberton, Queensland University of Technology, Australia  
Robin Mansell, London School of Economics and Political Science, UK  
Armand Mattelart, Université de Paris VIII, France  
Denis McQuail, School of Communication Research, University of Amsterdam,  
The Netherlands  
William Melody, Danish Technical University, Denmark  
Bernard Miège, Université Stendhal, France  
Martin Lea, University of Manchester, UK  
W. Russell Neuman, University of Pennsylvania/Annenberg, USA  
Kaarle Nordenstreng, University of Tampere, Finland  
Ronald E. Rice, University of California, Santa Barbara, USA  
Rohan Samarajiva, LIRNEasia, Sri Lanka  
Jorge Reina Schement, Penn State University, USA  
Marsha Siefert, Central European University, Hungary  
Roger Silverstone, London School of Economics and Political Science, UK  
Edward Soja, University of California, Los Angeles, USA  
Tapio Varis, University of Tampere, Finland  
Osmo Wiio, University of Helsinki, Finland  
Steve Woolgar, Oxford University, UK

# HANDBOOK *of* NEW MEDIA

Social Shaping and  
Social Consequences of ICTs

*Updated Student Edition*

*Edited by*  
LEAH A. LIEVROUW  
and SONIA LIVINGSTONE

Editorial Introduction © Leah A. Lievrouw and Sonia Livingstone 2006	Chapter 12 © Leah A. Lievrouw 2006
Chapter 1 © Nancy K. Baym 2006	Chapter 13 © Philip Cooke 2006
Chapter 2 © Nicholas W. Janowski 2006	Chapter 14 © Terry Flew and Stephen McElhinney 2006
Chapter 3 © David Buckingham 2006	Chapter 15 © Heather A. Hudson 2006
Chapter 4 © Ronald E. Rice and Caroline Haythornthwaite 2006	Chapter 16 © Stefaan G. Verhulst 2006
Chapter 5 © Andrea B. Hollingshead and Noshir S. Contractor 2006	Chapter 17 © François Bar with Caroline Simard 2006
Chapter 6 © Mark Poster 2006	Chapter 18 © Don Lamberton 2006
Chapter 7 © Jennifer Daryl Slack and J. MacGregor Wise 2006	Chapter 19 © Anders Henten and Knud Erik Skouby 2006
Chapter 8 © Timothy W. Luke 2006	Chapter 20 © Bella Mody, Harry M. Trebing and Laura Stein 2006
Chapter 9 © Patrice Flichy 2006	Chapter 21 © Laura Stein and Nikhil Sinha 2006
Chapter 10 © Sally J. McMillan 2006	Chapter 22 © Frank Webster 2006
Chapter 11 © Susan Leigh Star and Geoffry L. Bowker 2006	

First published 2002

This student edition published 2006

Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of research or private study, or criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, this publication may be reproduced, stored or transmitted in any form, or by any means, only with the prior permission in writing of the publishers, or in the case of reprographic reproduction, in accordance with the terms of licences issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside those terms should be sent to the publishers.



SAGE Publications Ltd  
1 Oliver's Yard  
55 City Road  
London EC1Y 1SP

SAGE Publications Inc.  
2455 Teller Road  
Thousand Oaks, California 91320

SAGE Publications India Pvt Ltd  
B-42, Panchsheel Enclave  
Post Box 4109  
New Delhi 110 017

#### **British Library Cataloguing in Publication data**

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN 1-4129-1873-1 (pbk)

#### **Library of Congress Control Number available**

Typeset by C&M Digital (P) Ltd., Chennai, India  
Printed in Great Britain by Cromwell Press Ltd, Trowbridge, Wiltshire

# Contents

Acknowledgements	vii
The Editors	ix
The Contributors	x
Introduction to the Updated Student Edition <i>Leah A. Lievrouw and Sonia Livingstone</i>	1
Introduction to the First Edition (2002) The Social Shaping and Consequences of ICTs <i>Leah A. Lievrouw and Sonia Livingstone</i>	15
<b>Part One: New Media, Culture and Society</b>	<b>33</b>
1 Interpersonal Life Online <i>Nancy K. Baym</i>	35
2 Creating Community with Media: History, Theories and Scientific Investigations <i>Nicholas W. Jankowski</i>	55
3 Children and New Media <i>David Buckingham</i>	75
4 Perspectives on Internet Use: Access, Involvement and Interaction <i>Ronald E. Rice and Caroline Haythornthwaite</i>	92
5 New Media and Small Group Organizing <i>Andrea B. Hollingshead and Noshir S. Contractor</i>	114
6 Culture and New Media: A Historical View <i>Mark Poster</i>	134
7 Cultural Studies and Communication Technology <i>Jennifer Daryl Slack and J. Macgregor Wise</i>	141
8 Power and Political Culture <i>Timothy W. Luke</i>	163

<b>Part Two: Technology Systems, Design and Industries</b>	<b>185</b>
9 New Media History <i>Patrice Flichy</i>	187
10 Exploring Models of Interactivity from Multiple Research Traditions: Users, Documents and Systems <i>Sally J. McMillan</i>	205
11 How to Infrastructure <i>Susan Leigh Star and Geoffrey C. Bowker</i>	230
12 New Media Design and Development: Diffusion of Innovations v Social Shaping of Technology <i>Leah A. Lievrouw</i>	246
13 New Media and New Economy Cluster Dynamics <i>Philip Cooke</i>	266
14 Globalization and the Structure of New Media Industries <i>Terry Flew and Stephen McElhinney</i>	287
15 Universal Access to the New Information Infrastructure <i>Heather E. Hudson</i>	307
<b>Part Three: New Media, Institutions and Governance</b>	<b>327</b>
16 The Regulation of Digital Content <i>Stefaan G. Verhulst</i>	329
17 From Hierarchies to Network Firms <i>François Bar with Caroline Simard</i>	350
18 New Media and the Economics of Information <i>Don Lamberton</i>	364
19 New Media and Trade Policy <i>Anders Henten and Knud Erik Skouby</i>	386
20 The Governance of Media Markets <i>Bella Mody, Harry M. Trebing and Laura Stein</i>	405
21 New Global Media and the Role of the State <i>Laura Stein and Nikhil Sinha</i>	415
22 The Information Society Revisited <i>Frank Webster</i>	443
Index	458

# Acknowledgements for the Updated Student Edition

For this Updated Student Edition of the Handbook, we would like to acknowledge the ideas, efforts and enthusiasm of everyone involved. The contributors responded readily when we asked them to review, update and expand their original chapters, with only a couple of months to complete the work. Our International Advisory Board provided months of reviewing and careful commentary on the draft chapters for the first edition, and the strength of the chapters we have selected to include here still reflects their good advice. We have been saddened by the deaths of Board members Everett Rogers and Rob Kling since the first edition was published. Although they worked in somewhat different domains (communication/sociology, and computer science/science and technology studies, respectively), each helped to shape and lay the groundwork for new media studies as a coherent field of research and scholarship.

We could not have completed the *Handbook* without significant institutional support, in terms of time and resources. We would therefore like to thank our colleagues at UCLA and LSE, who provided administrative and intellectual support (as well as the occasional airfare). Many thanks also to Shenja Vandergraaf at LSE, who has helped us with the updated student edition, working with intelligence, accuracy and good humour throughout.

Our commissioning editor at Sage, Julia Hall, was crucial to the success of the first edition, and was largely responsible for devising the student edition format, which is a new venture for Sage. We said it in the first edition, and it's still true: Julia is patient, strict, cheerful, resolute, reasonable, funny and much else as needed – the sort of commissioning editor any academic author would want.

And again, of course, we thank our partners, Dan Danzig and Peter Lunt, for their enthusiasm and steady support. In the years since we began working on the *Handbook* a simple professional collaboration has grown into a delightful four-way friendship. We look forward to many more productive and enjoyable years together.

We hope that you, the reader, find this *Handbook* as useful and inspiring as we have tried to make it.

Leah Lievrouw

University of California, Los Angeles

Sonia Livingstone

London School of Economics and Political Science





# The Editors

**Leah A. Lievrouw** is a Professor in the Department of Information Studies, part of the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, at the University of California, Los Angeles. She is also affiliated with UCLA's undergraduate program in Communication Studies. Her research and writing focus on the social and cultural changes associated with information and communication technologies and the relationship between new media technologies and knowledge, particularly problems of social equity, differentiation, and intellectual freedom. Her other books include *Mediation, Information and Communication: Information and Behavior*, vol. 3 (co-edited with Brent Ruben; Transaction, 1990) and *Competing Visions, Complex Realities: Social Aspects of the Information Society* (co-edited with Jorge Reina Schement; Ablex, 1987). From 2000 to 2005 she was co-editor of the journal *New Media & Society*, and the author of numerous journal articles, proceedings papers and book chapters on ICTs and society. Dr. Lievrouw received a Ph.D. in communication theory and research in 1986 from the Annenberg School for Communication at the University of Southern California, and holds an M.A. in biomedical communications from the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center in Dallas and a Bachelor of Journalism from the University of Texas at Austin. She was formerly a member of the faculties of the Department of Telecommunication and Film at the University of Alabama in Tuscaloosa, and of the Department of Communication at Rutgers University in New Brunswick, NJ.

**Sonia Livingstone** is Professor of Social Psychology and a member of the Department of Media and Communications at the London School of Economics and Political Science. She has published widely on the subject of media audiences. Her recent work concerns children, young people and the Internet, as part of a broader interest in the domestic, familial and educational contexts of new media access and use ([www.children-go-online.net](http://www.children-go-online.net)). Books include *Making Sense of Television* (2nd edition, Routledge, 1998), *Mass Consumption and Personal Identity* (with Peter Lunt, Open University Press, 1992), *Talk on Television* (with Peter Lunt, Routledge, 1994), *Children and Their Changing Media Environment* (edited with Moira Bovill, Erlbaum, 2001), *Young People and New Media* (Sage, 2002), *Audiences and Publics* (edited, Intellect, 2005) and, her current project, *Children and the Internet* (Polity, for 2006). Sonia Livingstone has been visiting Professor at the Universities of Copenhagen, Stockholm, Milan, Bergen and Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and is on the editorial board of several leading journals in the field, including *New Media & Society*, *The Communication Review*, *Journal of Communication*, *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media* and the *European Journal of Communication*. She is Non-Industry Vice Chair of the Internet Watch Foundation.

# The Contributors

**François Bar** is Associate Professor at the Annenberg School for Communication, University of Southern California. He previously served on the Communication faculty at Stanford University and at UC San Diego, and as a member of the Berkeley Roundtable on the International Economy (BRIE), at UC Berkeley. He has held visiting faculty appointments at the University of Toronto, the University of Paris-XIII, Théséus, and Eurécom. He received his Ph.D. from the UC Berkeley and holds a Diplôme d'Ingénieur from the Ecole Nationale des Ponts et Chaussées in Paris. Professor Bar's current research interests include comparative telecommunication policy, as well as economic, strategic and social dimensions of computer networking, new media and the Internet. His research has been published in books of collected studies, policy reports, and journals such as *Telecommunications Policy*, *The Information Society*, *Infrastructure Economics and Policy*, *Communications & Strategies*, *Réseaux*, *Organization Science*, and the *International Journal of Technology Management*.

**Nancy K. Baym** is an Associate Professor of Communication Studies at the University of Kansas, where she teaches communication on the Internet, interpersonal communication, nonverbal communication, and qualitative methods. Her ethnographic research into online community and television fandom appears in the book *Tune In, Log On: Soaps, Fandom, and Online Community* (Sage) and in several articles in journals and edited collections. In addition to online community, she has studied how the social life that takes place on the Internet is woven into the full fabric of mediated and unmediated interpersonal communication, work published in *New Media & Society* among other places. She served as President of the Association of Internet Researchers (2002–2005) and coordinated that association's first annual conference, 'Internet Research 1.0: The State of the Interdiscipline' in 2000. She is an editor of *The Internet Research Annual*, Volume I (2004, Peter Lang), a volume bringing together the best papers from the first three years of Association of Internet Researcher conferences. With Annette Markham, she is an editor of a forthcoming book examining key questions for the conduct of high-quality Internet research, which will likely be published in 2006. She serves on the editorial boards of *New Media & Society*, *The Information Society*, *The Journal of Communication*, and *Research on Language and Social Interaction*.

**Geoffrey C. Bowker** is Executive Director, Regis and Dianne McKenna Professor Center for Science, Technology and Society, Santa Clara University. He was previously Professor in and Chair of the Department of Communication, University of California, San Diego. His Ph.D is in History and Philosophy of Science at Melbourne University. He studies social and organizational aspects of the development of very

large-scale information infrastructures. His first book (*Science on the Run*, MIT Press) discussed the development of information practices in the oil industry. He has written with Leigh Star a book on the history and sociology of medical classifications (*Sorting Things Out: Classification and Practice* – published by MIT Press in September 1999). This book looks at the classification of nursing work, diseases, viruses and race. He has co-edited a volume on computer support cooperative work (*Social Science, Technical Systems and Cooperative Work: Beyond the Great Divide*, LEA Press, 1997). He has, since his invitation to join the biodiversity sub-committee of the President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology, been working in the field of biodiversity and environmental informatics. He has recently completed a digital government-funded project on long-term databases in environmental science (<http://pal.lternet.edu/dm/projects/02bdei/>). His next book, entitled *Memory Practices in the Sciences*, about formal and informal record-keeping in science over the past 200 years, which includes extensive discussion of biodiversity informatics, will be published by MIT Press in 2005. He was 2002–2003 member of an OECD working group on international data sharing in science (<http://dataaccess.sdsc.edu/> – the report can be found at this address). He is currently working on an NSF-funded project at the San Diego Computer Center on organizational and social dimensions of developing scientific cyberinfrastructures. More information, including a number of publications, can be found at his website: <http://epl.scu.edu/~gbowker>.

**David Buckingham** is Professor of Education at the Institute of Education, London University, where he directs the Centre for the Study of Children, Youth and Media ([www.childrenyouthandmediacentre.co.uk](http://www.childrenyouthandmediacentre.co.uk)). He has directed several major funded projects on media education, and on children's and young people's interactions with electronic media. He is the author, co-author or editor of 18 books, including *Children Talking Television* (Falmer, 1993), *Moving Images* (Manchester University Press, 1996), *The Making of Citizens* (Routledge, 2000), *After the Death of Childhood* (Polity, 2000) and *Media Education* (Polity, 2003). His work has been translated into 15 languages, and he has taught and addressed conferences in more than 25 countries around the world. He is currently directing research projects on young people's engagement with video games; informal learning and creativity in media education; the uses of digital media by migrant/refugee children across Europe; and young people's responses to sexual content in the media.

**Noshir S. Contractor** is a Professor in the Departments of Speech Communication and Psychology at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He is a Research Affiliate of the Beckman Institute for Advanced Science and Technology, Director of the *Science of Networks in Communities* (SONIC) Research Group at the National Center for Supercomputing Applications, and Co-Director of the *Age of Networks* Initiative at the Center for Advanced Study at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. His current research program is investigating factors that lead to the formation, maintenance, and dissolution of dynamically linked knowledge networks among profit, non-profit, government as well as non-government agencies involved in issues of public interest including emergency response, food

safety, public health, environmental engineering. His research has been funded continuously for the past decade by major grants from the U.S. National Science Foundation, as well as additional support from NASA, the National Cancer Institute, and the Rockefeller Foundation. His research has been published in journals including *Academy of Management Review*, *Communication Research*, *Computational and Mathematical Organizational Theory*, *Decision Science*, *Human Communication Research*, *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, *Journal of Cultural Economics*, *Organization Science*, *Small Group Research*, and *Social Psychology Quarterly*. His papers have received top-paper awards from both the International Communication Association and the National Communication Association. His book titled *Theories of Communication Networks* (co-authored with Professor Peter Monge, Oxford University Press) received the 2003 Book of the Year award from the Organizational Communication Division of the National Communication Association. He is the lead developer of *IKNOW* (Inquiring Knowledge Networks On the Web), a web-based social networking software (<http://iknow.spcomm.uiuc.edu>) and *Blanche*, a software program to simulate the dynamics of social networks (<http://csu1.spcomm.uiuc.edu/Projects/Teclab/Blanche/>).

**Philip Cooke** is University Research Professor and founding Director (1993) of the Centre for Advanced Studies, University of Wales, Cardiff. His research interests lie in studies of economics of biotechnology (partner in CESAGen Research Centre), regional innovation systems, knowledge economies, and policy actions for business clusters and networks. As a field leader in knowledge and innovation sciences he has coordinated and participated in six FP projects since 1995. He co-edited a book entitled *Regional Innovation Systems* in 1998, a fully revised 2nd edition of which is published in 2004. He co-authored a book on network governance called *The Associational Economy*, also published in 1998, and is co-author of *The Governance of Innovation in Europe* published in 2000. His recent book *Knowledge Economies: Clusters, Learning and Cooperative Advantage* was published by Routledge in 2002. In 2004 he published *Regional Economies as Knowledge Laboratories* (Edward Elgar). Professor Cooke was adviser to Lord Sainsbury's Biotechnology Clusters mission in 1999 and subsequently UK Government Cluster Policy, and Innovation Review Adviser. He has been EU Adviser on Regional Foresight, Universities & Regional Development, and in 2004–2005 Chairs the EU Committee on Constructing Regional Advantage. He is OECD Adviser on Knowledge Economies, and UNIDO Adviser on Innovation Systems. In addition to the books, he is author of more than 100 research and scholarly articles in leading journals. He is also Editor of *European Planning Studies*, a bi-monthly journal devoted to European urban and regional governance, innovation and development issues. In 2003 he was elected Academician of the UK Academy of Social Sciences (AcSS). In 2004 he was made Distinguished Research Fellow (PRIME) of the University of Ottawa Management School.

**Dr Terry Flew** is Associate Professor and Head of Media and Communication in the Creative Industries Faculty, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia. He is the author of *New Media Technologies: An Introduction* (Oxford, 2005, second edition), and *Understanding Global Media* (Palgrave, 2006). He has

authored six research monographs, 21 book chapters and 31 refereed journal articles, including a chapter on 'Creative Economy' to J. Hartley (ed.), *Creative Industries* (Blackwell, 2005). His research interests include new media technologies; media policy and regulation; creative industries theory and policy; the culture of services; media globalization; international trade agreements; censorship and classification; virtual communities and Internet theory; popular music and music policy; and broadcasting and cultural diversity. He is also Reviews Editor of *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies*, and Treasurer of the Australia and New Zealand Communications Association.

**Patrice Flichy** is Professor in the Department of Sociology at the University of Marne la Vallée in France, and editor of *Réseaux*, a French journal on communication studies. His research and writing focus on innovation and uses in ICT, in the past and today. His books include *L'imaginaire d'Internet* (La Découverte, 2001, English translation forthcoming at MIT Press); *Dynamics of Modern Communication: The Shaping and Impact of New Communication Technologies* (Sage, 1995). *L'innovation technique* (La Découverte, 1995); *European Telematics: The Emerging Economy of Words* (co-edited with Paul Beaud and Josiane Jouët, Elsevier, 1991).

Professor Flichy received a PhD in sociology in 1971 from the University of Paris-I. He also holds a degree in business management from the Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commerciales. He was formerly head of the Laboratory of Sociology of France Telecom Research Development.

**Caroline Haythornthwaite** is Associate Professor at the Graduate School of Library and Information Science, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. Her research focuses on the way computer-mediated interaction supports and affects interaction for work, learning, the exchange of information, and the construction of knowledge. Ongoing work includes social network studies of the way computer media affect members of distance learning environments and research collaboratives, with emphasis on social, communal, and conversational aspects. Her work appears in *The Information Society*, *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, *New Media & Society*, Jones' *Doing Internet Research*, Gackenbach's *Psychology and the Internet*, and Renninger and Shumar's *Building Virtual Community*. She recently co-edited with Barry Wellman *The Internet in Everyday Life* (2002), and with Michelle M. Kazmer, *Learning, Culture and Community in Online Education: Research and Practice*.

**Anders Henten** is Associate Professor at the Center for Information and Communication Technologies (CICT) at the Technical University of Denmark. He is a graduate in communications and international development studies from Roskilde University in Denmark and holds a PhD from the Technical University of Denmark. His main areas of research are socioeconomic implications of information and communication technologies including e-commerce and business models, internationalization of services, and regulations of communications. He teaches courses in 'e-commerce – markets and business models', 'standardization in telecommunications', and 'regulation of telecommunications'. Anders Henten has

worked professionally in the areas of communications economy and policy for more than a decade. He has published, nationally and internationally, more than 150 academic publications in international journals, books, anthologies, and conference proceedings.

**Andrea B. Hollingshead** is Associate Professor of Communication in the Annenberg School for Communication. Her research concerns how people in groups learn, store, retrieve, communicate, and use knowledge – in particular knowledge from and about others in the group. She seeks to identify the factors and processes that lead to effective knowledge sharing in groups including those that are technologically based. Professor Hollingshead has been an investigator on three large collaborative projects on information technology and knowledge sharing in organizations supported by the National Science Foundation. Her publications include two books, *Theories of Small Groups: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (2005, co-edited with Marshall Scott Poole) and *Groups Interacting with Technology* (1994, with Joseph E. McGrath). Her many articles have appeared in top-tier journals in the fields of communication, psychology and management. Professor Hollingshead is currently Senior Editor of *Organization Science*, and has served on many journal editorial boards.

**Heather E. Hudson** is Director of the Telecommunications Management and Policy Program in the School of Business and Management at the University of San Francisco. Dr Hudson has planned and evaluated communication projects in northern Canada, Alaska, and more than 50 developing countries in Africa, Asia and the Pacific, the Middle East, and Latin America. She has also consulted for government agencies, consumer and native organizations, foreign governments, telecommunications companies, and international organizations including the World Bank, the ITU, UNDP, UNESCO, USAID, CIDA, International Development Research Centre (IDRC), and the Commonwealth of Learning.

Dr Hudson received an Honours BA in English from the University of British Columbia, MA and Ph.D in Communication Research from Stanford University and JD from the University of Texas at Austin. She is the author of several books including *Global Connections: International Telecommunications Infrastructure and Policy*; *Communication Satellites: Their Development and Impact*; *When Telephones Reach the Village*, and co-author of *Rural America in the Information Age* and *Electronic Byways: State Policies for Rural Development through Telecommunications*. Dr Hudson has also published more than 100 articles and book chapters, and presented numerous conference papers, as well as providing expert testimony on telecommunications applications and domestic and international policy issues such as universal service, information infrastructure, and telecommunications planning for socioeconomic development.

**Nicholas W. Jankowski** (Ph.D., University of Amsterdam) is Associate Professor in the Department of Communication, Radboud University Nijmegen and Adjunct Professor, Department of Communication, University of Leuven. He has been involved in the investigation of community media and other small-scale communication



facilities since the mid-1970s. His publications include: *The People's Voice: Local Radio and Television in Europe*; *The Contours of Multimedia*; *Community Media in the Information Age*; and *A Handbook of Qualitative Methodologies for Mass Communication Research*. He is preparing a methodology textbook on new media research. His research interests include study of initiatives designed to contribute to public discourse through online environments and the role played by the Internet during electoral campaigns. Jankowski is co-editor of the journal *New Media & Society* and board member of the European Institute for Communication and Culture.

**Don Lamberton** is Adjunct Professor, Creative Industries Faculty, Queensland University of Technology and Adjunct Professor in Communication, University of Canberra. He edits *Information Economics and Policy* and *Prometheus*, and is a member of other editorial boards. His recent books are: *The Economics of Communication and Information* (1996), *The New Frontiers of Communications Policy* (1997), *Communication and Trade* (1998), *Managing the Global: Globalization, Employment and Quality of Life* (2002), and *The Economics of Language* (2002). He received his BEc degree from the University of Sydney and his D.Phil. from Oxford University. He has held appointments at many universities and research centres in the US and UK. He served as a member of Australian Government committees of inquiry (public libraries, industrial property, and marine industries science and technology) and as a consultant to OECD, UNESCO, ITU, UNCTC, Australian Bureau of Statistics, Australia Post, and Prices Surveillance Authority.

**Timothy W. Luke** is University Distinguished Professor of Political Science and co-director of the Center for Digital Discourse and Culture at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in Blacksburg, Virginia. His research interests are tied to the politics of information societies, international affairs, and ecological criticism. He has just completed a new critical study of ideological politics at a number of major museums in the United States, which is entitled *Museum Pieces: Probing the Powerplays at Culture, History, Nature, and Technology Museums* (University of Minnesota Press, forthcoming). His most recent books are *Capitalism, Democracy, and Ecology: Departing from Marx* (University of Illinois Press, 1999), and *Ecocritique: Contesting the Politics of Nature, Economy, and Culture* (University of Minnesota Press, 1997). He is also the author of *Shows of Force: Politics, Power and Ideology in Art Exhibitions* (Duke University Press, 1992).

**Stephen McElhinney** is Director of the Bachelor in International Communication at the Macquarie University Centre for International Communication (MUCIC) in Sydney, Australia. Prior to completing his PhD and joining MUCIC, he worked for the Special Broadcasting Service, the Australian government in areas of communications, intellectual property and arts policy and as a policy researcher with the Communications Law Centre. His research interests include the factors inhibiting the establishment of the knowledge society and the representation of international events on Australian television news. He has published on universal service in telecommunications and on the film and television preferences of Australian and Thai adolescents.



**Sally J. McMillan** is an Associate Professor in the Advertising Department School of Advertising and Public Relations at the University of Tennessee-Knoxville. Her research focuses on definitions and history of new media and the impacts of communication technology on organizations and society. She has a particular interest in the nature and role of interactivity in computer-mediated environments. She has also published several articles related to methodologies for online research. Her research has been published in journals such as *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, the *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, *New Media & Society*, *Journal of Advertising*, and the *Journal of Advertising Research*. Prior to earning her PhD in Communication and Society at the University of Oregon, McMillan worked for 15 years in communication-related roles in book publishing, newspaper reporting, public relations consulting, non-profit management, and executive-level marketing and management for computer technology firms. She teaches graduate and undergraduate courses in interactive advertising, advertising research, and advertising management.

**Bella Mody** holds the de Castro Chair in Global Media Studies at the School of Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of Colorado in Boulder. She specializes in the political economy of media in developing countries and in design research on public service applications of communication media. Dr Mody's books include *International and Development Communication: A 21st Century Perspective* (ed., Sage, 2003), *The Handbook of International and Intercultural Communication* (co-ed., Sage, 2001), *Telecommunication Politics* (co-ed., Lawrence Erlbaum, 1995), and *Designing Messages for Development Communication* (Sage, 1991). Her research articles have been published in *Communication Theory*, *The Journal of International Communication*, *The Information Society*, *The Journal of Communication*, *Telecommunication Policy*, *Media Development*, *Telematics and Informatics*, *Gazette*, *International Development Review*, *Educational Broadcasting International*, *Communication Research*, *Journal of Research in Personality*, and the *Journal of Social Psychology*. She was formerly a social scientist with the Satellite Instructional TV Experiment in the Government of India's space agency and a faculty member at Stanford University and San Francisco State University.

**Mark Poster** is a member of the Department of Film and Media Studies and a member of the History Department at the University of California, Irvine. He has courtesy appointments in the Department of Information and Computer Science and the Department of Comparative Literature. He is a member of the Critical Theory Institute. His recent and forthcoming books are: *Information Please: Culture and Politics in a Digital Age*; *What's the Matter with the Internet?: A Critical Theory of Cyberspace* (University of Minnesota Press, 2001); *The Information Subject* in Critical Voices Series (Gordon and Breach Arts International, 2001); *Cultural History and Postmodernity* (Columbia University Press, 1997); *The Second Media Age* (London: Polity and New York: Blackwell, 1995); and *The Mode of Information* (London: Blackwell and Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990).

**Ronald E. Rice** (PhD, MA, Stanford University, 1982) is the Arthur N. Rupe Professor of the Social Effects of Mass Communication in the Department of

Communication; Co-director of the Center for Film, Television and New Media, at University of California, Santa Barbara; and incoming President of the International Communication Association (2006–2007). He has co-authored or co-edited *Public Communication Campaigns* (3rd edn, 2000), *The Internet and Health Communication* (2000), *The New Media: Communication, Research and Technology* (1984), *Managing Organizational Innovation* (1987) and *Research Methods and the New Media* (1989). He has conducted research and published widely in communication science, public communication campaigns, computer-mediated communication systems, methodology, organizational and management theory, information systems, information science and bibliometrics, and social networks. His publications have won awards as best dissertation from the American Society for Information Science, and as best paper from the International Communication Association and the Academy of Management.

**Caroline Simard** (MA, Rutgers University, PhD, Stanford University) is a researcher at the Stanford Graduate School of Business. Her dissertation investigated the role of knowledge networks in the creation of regional clusters in the wireless industry. At the Graduate School of Business, she is part of a research project on the diffusion of managerial practices in the nonprofit sector. Her research interests include organizational behavior, new media, knowledge networks, the diffusion of innovations and regional clusters.

**Nikhil Sinha** is Associate Dean for Academic Affairs in the College of Communication at the University of Texas at Austin. He has also worked in the Information and Broadcasting Ministry of the Government of India and as a consultant to the Informatics and Telecommunications Division for the World Bank, and as an adviser to the Indian Telecommunications Commission and the Indian Planning Commission. He has published numerous articles and book chapters on international regulatory and policy issues on telecommunications and information technology.

**Knud Erik Skouby** is Professor and founding Director of the Center for Information and Communication Technologies (CICT) – a multidisciplinary teaching and research center at the Danish Technical University. His main area of research interest includes the techno-economics of the telecom sector and of new telecom applications and services. He has participated as a project manager and partner in a number of international, European and Danish research projects. He has served as a member of organizing boards and evaluation committees and as invited speaker to international conferences, published a number of Danish and international articles, books and conference proceedings in the areas of telecommunications regulation, technology assessment (information technology and telecommunications), demand forecasting and political economy.

**Jennifer Daryl Slack** is Professor of Communication and Cultural Studies at Michigan Technological University Department of Humanities. Her work on culture and technology is based on over 25 years of teaching and study. Notably,

she has taught courses on culture and technology since 1981 and tracked the changes in her students' sense of the role and importance of technology. She is author of *Communication Technologies and Society* (Ablex, 1984), co-editor of *The Ideology of the Information Age* (Ablex, 1987), and author of numerous articles on culture and technology. *Culture and Technology: A Primer*, co-authored with J. Macgregor Wise, is in press from Peter Lang.

**Susan Leigh Star** is Senior Scholar at the Center for Science, Technology and Society at the University of Santa Clara. She is a Visiting Faculty at the Stanford Center for BioEthics, and president-elect of the Society for the Social Study of Science (4S). She writes about the social and historical aspects of science, information and technology, particularly on the values embedded in information technologies. With Geoffrey Bowker, she is the author of *Sorting Things Out: Classification and Its Consequences* (MIT Press, 1999), and has edited a number of other volumes, including *Ecologies of Knowledge* (SUNY, 1995), and with Martha Lampland, of *Formalizing Practices: Interpretive Approaches to Standardizing, Quantifying and Formalizing* (under review at Duke University Press). Her training was in the symbolic interactionist/pragmatist tradition in American sociology, which has grounded her research in the study of work, identity and meaning. She has also written on feminist theory, and is a poet.

**Laura Stein** is an Assistant Professor in the Radio-Television-Film Department at the University of Texas at Austin. She writes about communication law and policy, political communication, and alternative and public media. Her work appears in numerous journals and books, including *Communication Law and Policy*, *Media, Culture & Society*, *Javnost/The Public*, *Community Media in the Information Age*, and *Radical Media*. Her forthcoming book, entitled *Sustaining Speech Rights: The First Amendment, Democracy and the Media* (University of Illinois Press), explores the failure of speech rights to protect democratic communication in US media. She heads the Community Communication Division of the International Association for Media and Communication Research. Dr Stein began her career in the management, production, and distribution of public and educational media. She has an MA in Education from Columbia University, a Ph.D. in Communication from UT Austin, and a BA from the University of California at Berkeley.

**Harry M. Trebing** is Professor of Economics Emeritus and Senior Fellow at the Institute of Public Utilities, Michigan State University. Founder of the Institute, he served as its director from 1966 until his retirement in 1992. He has also served as Chief Economist, US Postal Rate Commission and US Federal Communications Commission, and as a member of advisory panels for government agencies and the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment. He currently serves as Chairman, Michigan Utility Consumer Participation Board (by appointment of the Governor). The author of numerous publications dealing with public utility regulation, he is the recipient of distinguished service awards from the National Association of State Utility Consumer Advocates, the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners, five universities, and the Government of Guam,

among others. He holds the BA and MA degrees from the University of Maryland and the Ph.D. degree from the University of Wisconsin.

**Stefaan G. Verhulst** is currently Chief of Research at the Markle Foundation. Prior to his arrival at Markle, where he held the previous positions of Director of Internet Governance and Director Policy for a Networked Society, Verhulst was the founder and director of the Programme in Comparative Media Law and Policy (PCMLP) at Oxford University, as well as Senior Research Fellow at the Centre for Socio-Legal Studies. In that capacity he was appointed the socio-legal Research Fellow at Wolfson College (Oxford). In addition, he was the UNESCO Chairholder in Communications Law and Policy for the UK. Before his move to Oxford in 1996, he had been a Lecturer on communications law and policy issues in Belgium and founder and co-director of the International Media and information-communications Policy and Law studies (IMPS) at the School of Law, University of Glasgow. Verhulst has served as consultant to various international and national organizations including the Council of Europe, the European Commission and Parliament, UNESCO, UNDP, USAID and DFID. He has published several books and numerous articles on communications law and policy issues and is invited regularly to speak at conferences globally. He is also the founder of the *International Journal of Communications Law and Policy* and the *Communications Law, in Transition* Newsletter.

**Frank Webster** is Professor of Sociology at City University London. He has published many books, including: *The New Photography: Responsibility in Visual Communication* (1980), *Information Technology: A Luddite Analysis* (with Kevin Robins, 1986), *The Technical Fix: Computers, Industry and Education* (with Kevin Robins, 1989), *The Postmodern University? Contested Visions of Higher Education* (with Anthony Smith, 1997), *Times of the Technoculture: From the Information Society to the Virtual Life* (with Kevin Robins) (1999); *Understanding Contemporary Society: Theories of the Present* (with Gary Browning and Abigail Halcli, 2000), and *Politics and Culture in the Information Age: A New Politics?* (2001), *The Virtual University* (with Kevin Robins, 2002), *Theories of the Information Society* (1995, 2nd edition 2002); *The Intensification of Surveillance* (with Kirstie Ball, 2003), *The Information Society Reader* (2004), and *Manuel Castells*, 3 vols (2004). He is currently preparing, with Howard Tumber, *Front Line Correspondents and Information War* and a 3rd edition of *Theories of the Information Society*.

**J. Macgregor Wise** (PhD, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign) is Associate Professor and Chair of Communication Studies at Arizona State University, West Campus. His work is situated at the intersection of cultural studies, media studies, and the sociology and philosophy of technology. He is author of *Exploring Technology and Social Space* (Sage, 1997), co-author (with Jennifer Daryl Slack) of *Culture and Technology: A Primer* (Peter Lang, 2005), and co-author (with Lawrence Grossberg, Ellen Wartella, and D. Charles Whitney) of *Media Making: Mass Media in a Popular Culture*, 2nd edition (Sage, in press).



# Introduction to the Updated Student Edition

LEAH A. LIEVROUW AND SONIA LIVINGSTONE

The manuscript for the first edition of the *Handbook of New Media* went to the London publisher in mid-2001. In that volume, we and our contributing authors made numerous observations about the history, role, functions, meanings and implications of new media technologies and uses across a diverse range of social, cultural and institutional settings. Perhaps the most accurate was our sense of how rapidly the study of networked information and communication technologies was spreading across disciplines, specialities and perspectives. If anything, the proliferation and fragmentation of work we identified has accelerated since the first edition appeared in print. In the introduction (which is included in the present volume), we argued that the intellectual eclecticism and openness of new media studies was one of its great strengths, difficult as it might be to survey or synthesize the field from any single point of view. We offered the *Handbook* then, as we do now, as our effort to counter the ‘Balkanization’ of new media studies that was dividing the field into dozens of specialized, non-communicating academic niches.

Some of the changes anticipated in the first edition were fairly predictable. New media (with ‘the Internet’ at the top of the list as a kind of archetype) have become everyday technologies, thoroughly embedded and routinized in the societies where they are most widely used. New media have not replaced older media, any more than broadcasting replaced print in the mid-twentieth century. Rather, people’s information and communication environments have become ever more individualized

and commodified, integrating print, audio, still and moving images, broadcasting, telecommunications, computing, and other modes and channels of communication and information sharing.

As this last point suggests, the convergence of new media with other media and information sources and services has also continued apace, although the rush of technological innovation and novelty in the 1990s has given way to more incremental refinements and adaptations in the 2000s. ICTs have gone from radical to routine, in part because of two major events that neither we nor our contributors foresaw. In 2001, the dot.com bubble was about to evaporate, and the events of September 11 of that year would soon bring the dangers of global technology networks employed in the interests of radical ideologies – and of those who would suppress those ideologies – into stark relief.

Reduced economic expectations and the hovering threat of terrorist violence, both vividly portrayed in the mass media, quickly dampened what many analysts considered to be an ‘overheated’ and speculative information technology sector, and created new demands for ICT systems that were safe, stable, and ubiquitous. Popular interest in new media shifted from invention, novelty and risk to regulation, reliability and safety. Among researchers, perspectives on social change likewise turned from revolutionary to evolutionary processes. As several contributors to the fifth anniversary issue of the journal *New Media & Society* noted in 2004, the previous five years had been notable for the ‘banalization’ of ICTs, and their assimilation

and reconfiguration to suit the demands, norms and expectations of everyday life, including expectations about communication itself and its constitutive role in society (Lievrouw, 2004).

None of these changes, however, has caused new media studies to lose momentum – far from it. It is precisely the astonishing success of new media that now confronts researchers with new questions of scale and capacity, of network architecture and infrastructural robustness, of international legal and regulatory frameworks, and of public trust, security and e-crime (Livingstone, in press). The routinization of new media has also required richer and more sophisticated theorizing, and in this volume the chapter authors identify multiple paths ahead and maintain a healthy scepticism as they examine the claims for change, weigh evidence, seek to clarify concepts and, always, acknowledge the limits as well as the insights of research.

As research has continued to pursue what we called the ‘moving target’ of social and technological innovation, certain milestones have been noted. For example, in his contribution to the special issue of *New Media & Society* mentioned earlier, Wellman (2004: 124) describes three ‘ages of Internet studies’. The first age, beginning in the mid-1990s, was what he called ‘punditry rides rampant’: the optimistic celebration of the transformative potential of the Internet, peppered with dystopian prognostications from the sceptics. Then, with the dot.com bust at the turn of the twenty-first century, the second age turned to a more serious engagement with evidence, seeking to document users and uses of the Internet; or as Wellman and Haythornthwaite (2002: 4) put it, researchers sought to study the Internet ‘as it descends from the firmament and becomes embedded in everyday life’. Our hope is that this updated edition of the *Handbook* will contribute to the present, third age and the move ‘from documentation to analysis’ (Wellman, 2004: 27).

## DEFINITIONS, REVISITED

In the first edition, we also rejected definitions of new media based solely on particular

technical features, channels or content. Instead, deliberately incorporating both technological and social, political and economic factors, we defined them as ‘information and communication technologies and their associated social contexts’ (p. 23, this volume), and specifically (following the lead of our contributors Susan Leigh Star and Geof Bowker) as infrastructures with three components: the *artefacts or devices* used to communicate or convey information; the *activities and practices* in which people engage to communicate or share information; and the *social arrangements or organizational forms* that develop around those devices and practices. For this updated edition, we have reorganized the chapters along these lines. The first part examines practices in cultural and social context. The second part focuses on the technologies themselves and their design and development. The third part takes a more macro-level, institutional view of the ways that new media technologies and practices are organized and governed. Within this three-part structure, we have asked all our chapter authors to provide the ‘back story’ to their topic – how did research get to where it is today, by making what assumptions, encountering which problems, and cross-fertilizing with which other fields?

Of course, all technologies – not just ICTs – can be framed and analyzed in terms of artefacts, practices and social arrangements. For communication research and related fields, the central question concerning technology today is whether the particular configurations of artefacts, practices, and social arrangements associated with new media differ, and in what ways, from those that characterized older information and communication technologies.

Our main conclusion is that new media require us to reconsider the longstanding dependence within media research on theories and phenomena of mass society. In the days of *mass* media, a related but different three-part framework, encompassing *production*, *text*, and *audience*, dominated media research and scholarship. As in our three-part scheme, each aspect is essential, and the dialogue among the various disciplines that has evolved to address each part has contributed to making media



studies so engaging. The differences between the two frameworks are also important, however. Not only are *artefacts*, *practices*, and *social arrangements* broader terms than *production*, *text*, and *audience*; they are also more thoroughly ‘socialized’ and inherently culturally and historically conditioned.<sup>1</sup>

Most important, we do not specify *a priori* any set relationship among the three component processes of infrastructure. Where the mass communication tradition has spent decades struggling with and, more recently, unpicking the linear relationship among production, text, and audience (i.e., production makes texts which have effects or impacts on audiences, consistent with the sender–message–receiver model of communication), in new media research no such linear assumption is necessary. This is why we emphasize social shaping and social consequences together, in Michel Callon’s term, as an *ensemble*: it is precisely the dynamic links and interdependencies among artefacts, practices and social arrangements that should guide our analytic focus. These dynamic interrelations are not infinitely flexible, however, and our use of the term *infrastructure* is intended to suggest that artefacts, practices, and social arrangements – and the relations among them – can and do become routine, established, institutionalized, and fixed to various extents, and so become taken for granted in everyday life.

As many of the following chapters demonstrate, new media studies have been strongly influenced by theories of post-industrial, late modern, or postmodern society, which posit ‘the emergence of a new economic order characterised by the central importance of information and theoretical knowledge, and by a shift from a goods-producing to a service society’ (Golding, 2000: 169; see Webster, Chapter 21 this volume). Signs of this shift, including the commodification of information, widespread diffusion of ICTs, diversity of message and content forms, interconnected social and technical networks, the rise of ‘information work’, and the privileging of abstract knowledge are all pivotal elements in accounts of new media technologies within the framework of post-industrial or information

society (Schement and Lievrouw, 1987), and are taken for granted in new media studies. But they play little if any role in theories of mass society and mass media.

The impressive array of literature that has now accumulated in new media studies demonstrates that in many ways, the relatively orderly terrain of mass society has been transformed into a new and emergent environment of network forms, roles, relations and dynamics. Mass production, distribution and economies of scale now contend with network externalities, cumulative advantage processes and power laws.<sup>2</sup> Research that formerly examined audiences, reception and effects must now account for users and uses, interactivity, reconfiguration, and reciprocity. Linear narratives and genres that were associated with particular media technologies and forms in the past – the novel, the Hollywood film, the LP record album, the crime drama – are absorbed into hyperlinked, hybrid content that is generated and shared via diverse channels. The inextricably linked phenomena of information, communication and mediation are no longer the sole province of communication research and a few related specialties; today they are the focus of intense interest and study across the social sciences, arts and humanities. Multidisciplinary approaches are thus essential in new media studies, even as they pose both theoretical and methodological challenges and bring hitherto distinct fields into conjunction (and sometimes, confrontation) with each other.

Communication and media research, then, is at a conceptual and disciplinary crossroads. As we argue below, it is time to rethink the role of ‘the mass’ in technology and society. First, however, we revisit the proposal that what make new media ‘new,’ and what distinguishes mediation today from the mass media of the past, are the distinctive ways in which the technologies develop – their *social shaping* – and their social *consequences*.

## SOCIAL SHAPING OF ICTs

The term social shaping, borrowed from science and technology studies, is usually associated



with the critique of strong technological determinism and a shift toward strong social determinism in the 1970s and 1980s in that field (MacKenzie and Wajcman, 1999). As Raymond Williams noted of mass communication research several decades ago, ‘in *technological determinism*, research and development have been assumed as self-generating. The new technologies are invented as it were in an independent sphere, and then create new societies or new human conditions’ (1974: 13, italics in original). Although recent writing about new media in cultural studies and media arts and design often takes a technologically deterministic tone (e.g. Manovich, 2001; Poster, 1990; Stone, 1995), new media researchers in the social sciences are virtually united in rejecting accounts in which technological innovation is the cause and society is the effect (see e.g. Woolgar, 2002). Instead, they have adopted the counter-view that ‘the technological, instead of being a sphere separate from social life, is part of what makes society possible – in other words, it is constitutive of society’ (MacKenzie and Wajcman, 1999: 23). This social-determinist view ‘migrated’ to communication research, cultural studies, information studies and other fields in the 1980s, and by the early 1990s it had displaced the technologically deterministic, ‘new society’ discourse common in communication research previously. It has subsequently become the dominant perspective in new media studies (Boczkowski and Lievrouw, forthcoming; Livingstone, in press).

The inclusion of ‘social shaping’ in the subtitle may thus seem to associate the *Handbook* with this strong social-determinist view. However, by social shaping we mean to suggest more of a mutual shaping process in which technological development and social practices are co-determining (for a fuller discussion, see Boczkowski, 2004). As we put it in the introduction to the first edition, ‘On the one hand, there is a concern with agency and action; on the other, a concern with social effects, structure and impacts’ (2002: 11). Or, to quote Bruno Latour’s memorable phrase, ‘technology is society made durable’ (1991: 103). People always have choices about how technologies are created, understood and used. However,

when certain technologies become very extensive, embedded and taken for granted (e.g. voice telephony, broadcast television, newspaper publishing, and increasingly, the Internet), they can also constrain or limit the range of available choices. This too is a social process, as Agre points out when he observes that, ‘every system affords a certain range of interpretations, and that range is determined by the discourses that have been inscribed into it’ (2004: 27). Thus, technology, action and social context are inseparable phenomena, each influencing the other.<sup>3</sup>

Technology, action and social context are usefully located within the wider analytic framework of late modernity, a framework that identifies multiple vectors of change. Appadurai (1996: 33–6) identifies five key dimensions of change along which we can analyze the ‘social’ that prefaces the ‘shaping’ and ‘consequences’ of the *Handbook* title: the ethnoscape (the shifting landscape of persons, identities, diaspora), the technoscape (the fluid, networked configuration of technologies), the financescapes (the disposition of global capital), the mediascapes (the distribution of information, images and audiences) and the ideoscapes (the ideologies and counter-ideologies which link images and ideas to the power of states). Whether or not one agrees with these, especially the separation of technoscape and mediascape, his purpose, like that of many of our chapter authors, is, importantly, to examine the disjunctures between economy, culture and politics that arise from the interaction among diverse flows, thus opening up dynamic rather than a static conception of ‘the social’.

## Recombination

In the first edition, we focused our analysis of this dynamic in relation to two modes of social shaping which we believe distinguish new media from more conventional, linear, one-to-many, mass media processes and effects. The first is *recombination*, the ‘continuous hybridization of both existing technologies and innovations in interconnected technical and institutional networks’ (p. 23, this volume). Recombination

has two main forms – convergence and divergence – both of which are readily observable in the development of new media technologies, message forms, social practices and cultural/economic institutions. As the product of an ongoing cycle of human action and available technical and cultural resources, new media technologies are continuously ‘renewed’. Although they are usually created with particular purposes or uses in mind, they are commonly adopted and used in unanticipated ways – reinvented, reconfigured, sabotaged, adapted, hacked, ignored. This process, with its often unintended consequences, reinforces the persistent sense of ‘newness’ and pivotal change associated with ICTs.

Certainly, recombination and a sense of novelty are still associated with new media design and use. New features and options continue to be introduced, even if they currently tend to merge, elaborate or extend existing functions rather than constitute radically new and unfamiliar ones. As Star and Bowker point out in Chapter 11, like other established infrastructures, new media are ‘built on an installed base’. However, unlike mass media, which by the late twentieth century had stabilized into a few major channels or forms (due to spectrum scarcity and the establishment of technical and formal standards), the forms and genres of new media continue to branch, recombine and proliferate. Marshall McLuhan (1964) observed that older media often become the content of newer media. Today, this has become an ongoing process of ‘remediation’ in which older media are appropriated, refashioned or absorbed by the new, therefore simultaneously shaping the new and reshaping the familiar (Bolter and Grusin, 1999).

To cite just a few examples, web logs (blogs), which have grown from an arcane curiosity to a common and popular mode of online communication in just a few years, are created with easy-to-use software that merges the graphic and hyperlinking features of web pages with those of older, collaborative, computer-mediated communication forms such as bulletin boards, teleconferencing, and e-mail (Coleman, 2004). Similarly, text messaging combines the tight, telegraphic style and ‘emoticons’ of ARPANET-era

e-mail messaging with the mobility and person-to-person access of cellular telephony (Ling, 2004). Multi-user games use web sites, hyperlinks and chat rooms as gateways to richly animated, cinematic ‘worlds’ in which hundreds of players participate and interact simultaneously, as both ‘audiences’ and ‘players’ (Gee, 2003). Each of these not only expands the range of information and communication possibilities, affording new or different forms of social relationships and experiences, but it also ‘remediates’ (rather than replacing or displacing) older forms such as diary writing, voice telephony, or video games.

### The Network Metaphor

The second mode of social shaping of new media, the *network metaphor*, suggests that

... the point-to-point network has become ... the archetypal form of contemporary social and technical organization ... [it] denotes a broad, multiplex interconnection in which many points or nodes (persons, groups, machines, collections of information, organizations) are embedded. Links among nodes may be created or abandoned on an as-needed basis at any location in the system, and any node can be either a sender or a receiver of messages – or both. (p. 24, this volume)

Networks in this sense depart from the hierarchical, one-way distribution configurations typically associated with mass society, mass production and consumption, and mass media. To the extent that society is a ‘network of networks’ (Castells, 2002), researchers are rethinking the once dominant ‘one-to-many’ frame of mass communication and its role relative to one-to-one and many-to-many (or n-way) modes of communication. These multiple, shifting configurations have important implications for the management of authority, trust and participation in social relations, and the control and diffusion of information. Perhaps even this distinction – between n-way and mass or broadcast communication – is being surpassed by new and hybrid modes of communication and information seeking and sharing that incorporate whatever forms of transmission that best suit the purposes at hand. Certainly, the network metaphor

increasingly dominates cultural, social and technological discourse in technologically advanced societies. It is the basic assumption underlying both the advocacy and the critique of globalization, for example, and a central trope in the discourses surrounding security, community, migration, transportation, trade, political mobilization and information flows, among many others, that have evolved since the events of 9/11.

## CONSEQUENCES OF ICTs

The *consequences* of new media technologies – the sociotechnical outcomes of the mutual shaping process – also distinguish them from mass media systems, mass communication processes and mass audiences. In the first edition, we discussed two consequences in particular: ubiquity and interactivity.

### Ubiquity

*Ubiquity* is the sense that new media technologies ‘affect everyone in the societies where they are employed’ (p. 25, this volume), even if not everyone in those societies actually use them. One example of the sense of ubiquity – or, more accurately, the sense that ubiquity is both desirable and inevitable – was seen over a decade ago when the existence of a ‘digital divide’ was identified in the US (National Telecommunications and Information Administration, 1995; 1998).

Subsequently, this single issue stimulated an enormous outpouring of empirical research and commentary, both supporting and critical, around the world. Some observers argued that the uneven or inequitable distribution of ICTs and the abilities to use them constituted a clear and pressing social problem. Others questioned the extent and/or the significance of the differences among social groups, or suggested that the problem would solve itself as the technologies diffused (see Bucy and Newhagen, 2004; Compaine, 2001; Gandy, 2002; Lievrouw and Farb, 2003; Light, 2001; Loader, 1998; Murdock, 2002; Selwyn, 2004; Warschauer,

2003). The debates themselves generated a variety of policy and regulatory schemes intended to rectify various divides or gaps among ethnic and economic groups, states, neighbourhoods, nations, regions and so on, such as the e-rate subsidy for Internet access in US public schools and libraries, and the European Union’s Information Society initiative.

Perhaps what is most notable about the sheer volume of interest and work in this area is that it has been built on the assumption that the ubiquity of ICTs is a public good, with surprisingly little analysis of whether ICTs are, indeed, to be uncritically promoted, or whether gaining access to the Internet or other new media technologies is so obviously a ‘good thing’. The model of access most often invoked with regard to ICTs is that of voice telephony, where telephone service is seen as a basic necessity and therefore governed or regulated on the basis of ‘universal service’ or ‘universal access’ principles or obligations (Lievrouw, 2000). In contrast, the ubiquity of mass media (or lack thereof) was not generally framed this way. No literature sprang up to document and criticize television or radio ‘divides’, for example, when those technologies were introduced. On the contrary, considerable research effort was devoted to controlling or minimizing exposure to television – to reduce children’s viewing, or to regulate adult tastes for films, video and electronic games.<sup>4</sup>

Another example of how expectations of ubiquity have influenced the development and use of ICTs is the growing use and versatility of mobile technologies. As transistors, microchips, and more recently, nanotechnologies have made it possible to build smaller and more portable electronic devices, expectations have also shifted about where those devices can be used, by whom, and for what purposes. ‘Mobility’ today is an expectation predicated not only on miniaturization, but also on ubiquitous, interoperable transmission networks with common or ‘convertible’ standards (e.g. tri- or quad-band GSM for mobile phones, or 802.11b/Bluetooth/wi-fi for wireless Internet access; Ling, 2004). In traditional workplace, classroom and household settings dominated by mass media, technologies are physically fixed and typically shared; mobile

technologies today, in contrast, are designed as personal tools or accessories that provide access to a variety of individualized content and communications services, no matter where the users, services or resources happen to be (Livingstone, 2002).

## Interactivity

The second consequence that, in our view, distinguishes new media from earlier mass media channels and content is the pervasive sense of *interactivity* associated with newer channels, that is, the selectivity and reach that media technologies afford users in their 'choices of information sources and interactions with other people' (p. 25, this volume). The immediacy, responsiveness and social presence of interaction via new media channels constitute a qualitatively and substantively different experience than what was possible via mass media channels (even those to which the term 'interactive' was sometimes too generously applied, such as remote control television). Although debates continue about the nature and quality of mediated interaction, especially in contrast with face-to-face conversation as the presumed 'ideal' mode of interpersonal communication (Lievrouw and Finn, 1990), mediated interactivity nonetheless has long been cited as a definitive difference between new media and mass media (see McMillan, Chapter 10 in this volume; also Ball-Rokeach and Reardon, 1988; Bryant and Street, 1988; Rafaeli, 1988; Reeves and Nass, 1996; Rice and Associates, 1984; Rogers, 1986).

## FROM MASS MEDIA TO MEDIATION

Mediated communication today, then, differs from mass media 'processes and effects' in that it is recombinant, networked, ubiquitous and interactive. New media research and scholarship have moved away from a dependence on theories of mass society and toward post-industrial or post-modern theories of society. What are the implications of these developments for media and communication studies more generally?

As we noted in the first edition, the difficulties for the field are illustrated by the persistent problem of how to characterize people *collectively* with regard to their sociality and cultural practices via media and information technologies. As the dominance of mass communications began to unravel at the end of the twentieth century, audience researchers were already seeking different terms for understanding the power of the media – moving away from the language of effects or impacts, towards a conception of the active audience (Livingstone, 2004b), the diffused, embedded audience (Abercrombie and Longhurst, 1998), or more broadly, towards 'new audience studies' (Gray, 1999; see also Ang, 1990; Hartley, 1988). However, among audience researchers this rethinking, prompted by the interpretative and ethnographic turn that swept the social sciences more generally, remained focused primarily on television which, despite becoming more globalized, diversified, and even 'interactive', was (and still is) mainly used within the domestic domain of leisure and entertainment.

The convergence of ICTs that has been facilitated and shaped by the parallel convergence of entertainment, education, work and civic activities, and interpersonal communication, requires a more radical rethinking of people's relations with and understanding of ICTs. Today, mediated content and interaction are socially diversified (rather than directed primarily at the masses), channels are technologically convergent (rather than distinct systems), and mediated communication processes are interactive (rather than one-to-many, with separate producer and receiver roles). As we said in the first edition, 'new media and information technologies open up new, more active modes of engagement with media – *playing* computer games, *surfing* the Web, *searching* databases, *writing* and *responding* to email, *visiting* a chat room, *shopping* online, and so on' (2002: 10). These activities have since been joined by *blogging*, *mobbing*, *texting*, *IMing*, *spoofing*, and a dozen more. The list of new media uses, applications, activities and contents is in continual flux. Some of the terms are individual, some collective, some are mixed modes; some

describe the content of the communication, some the act of communicating, some both.

Obviously, the single term *audience* does not capture this diversity of activity. We cannot say, *the internet audience*, though some try. 'Users' does not work either, though more try this. The word is too broad (having no particular relation to information or communication), too instrumental (if people are 'users' of computers or telephones, they are also users of pens, batteries, washing powder, automobiles and a host of other things that don't involve human contact), too individualistic (lacking both the collective status and power suggested by 'audience' and the relational sense of interaction and shared understanding), and too material (referring to the tools and techniques of communication rather than to content, meaning, interaction or shared understanding). *Internet users* works only because it is entirely vague: it doesn't exclude anything; neither does it suggest that there is anything specific about the ways people engage with or understand the technology. It's an empty term that homogenizes uses and 'users' as a category, contrasting them only with an equally empty category of 'nonusers'. So the language problem remains in conveying a sense of what might be new, and specifically related to communication and information, in contemporary engagement with ICTs.

What shall we say instead? *People* is as good a term as any, and better than some. This is not a trite suggestion: try putting *people* in place of *users* in social science and engineering accounts of ICTs. Immediately, human interests, concerns, knowledge and rights leap into focus (while it seems peculiar to talk about the civic potential of audiences, the rights of users, or the creativity of consumers). *People* captures their individuality and their collectivity; the word is neutral about their abilities and interests, but resolutely advances their needs and rights and takes their plurality and diversity for granted. *People* can be used by any academic discipline, introduces no new jargon, and includes us, the observers, in the frame of analysis. And it works in other languages besides English (unlike *audience*, *users*, and *consumers*; Livingstone, 2005).

The word also puts people's agency and action at the centre of new media studies, rather than the labels or categories we apply to them or to the devices they use. Again, this contrasts with most concepts of 'mass society', where individual and group agency tends to be underplayed or discounted, and of 'mass communication', where communicative behaviour is seen primarily as a response to stimulus, in terms of reception and effects, rather than in terms of action. Interestingly, the attempt by some media researchers to rescue and rehabilitate the term 'audience' by emphasizing audience members' agency and aligning them with creative, self-organizing publics (Livingstone, 2005), itself demonstrates a shift in focus from simple relation to the medium to a more contextualized account of agency in everyday life.

If we take agency and action seriously, we must reframe media and information technologies not just as powerful message-generating entities that influence behaviour and society, but also as resources that provide people with opportunities to cultivate their agency and as tools that allow them to act. By thinking of new media as resources for agency and action, we move away from the predominant view of 'mass media' as relatively fixed, stable and depersonalized institutional entities that have effects *on* people, to a view that considers what people do *with* media and each other – that is, we reorient communication research and scholarship toward the process of mediation.

Previously we defined new media as infrastructures for communication and information that comprise particular types of artefacts, practices and social arrangements; they are socially shaped in distinctive ways and have characteristic social consequences. We can further define *communication* as coordinated action that achieves understanding or shares meaning (Rogers and Kincaid, 1981), and *information* as the organized, expressed and intelligible representation or product of the communication process; the two phenomena are inextricably linked and interdependent (Lievrouw, 2001). *Mediation* therefore enables, supports or facilitates communicative action and representation. It is not simply the



intervention or insertion of technology into the communication process or information production; it entails all three elements of infrastructure: artefacts (e.g. alphabets, electrical grids, keyboards and mice, operating systems, telephone switches, film stock, satellite dishes, money, etc.), practices (e.g. gestures, vocalization, telephone or email etiquette, language, manuscript formatting, typing, online file sharing, fashion, contract law, television program schedules, blogging, etc.), and social arrangements (e.g. single-parent families, recorded music labels, think tanks, national film boards, political campaigns, community advice networks, movie studios, etc.). The ubiquity of information and communicative action, recombinant modes of access, use and content, dynamic point-to-point network structures, and the sense of personal engagement and interactivity afforded by new ICTs can be thought of as contemporary modes or patterns of mediation that differ from those that were possible via mass media.

Several observers have already proposed that mediation itself should be a central framing idea in new media studies, for 'our communication society is based on mediations between texts and people, in that people pass and meet each other through texts, just as texts pass and encounter each other through people' (Fornas, 2002: 104). New information and communication technologies raise particular and challenging questions regarding these processes. For example, Stefaan Verhulst, in arguing for a 'new mediation ecology', points out that

The arrival of new information and communication technologies led to a belief that we witnessed a decrease of the importance of mediation and the arrival of abundance. Yet, instead of the widely predicted process of disintermediation that was supposed to accompany emerging technologies, we are currently forced to confront a process of reintermediation, marked by new actors and methods of disseminating information and framing reality ... we are only on the verge of understanding what the social implications of the new mediating forces might be ... (2005)

Likewise, Roger Silverstone critiques the traditional, modernist view among some communication researchers that mass media technologies, and by extension mediation itself, distort or corrupt an otherwise idealized,

symmetrical experience of interpersonal interaction. He suggests that mediation today must be understood as both 'literal and metaphorical', as technologies, institutions, messages and meanings all interact and influence each other recursively (2005: 30).

Moves from mass society, singular, towards networked societies and relations, plural, have entailed corresponding shifts in people's engagement with media technologies and each other, from mass audiences (powerful in their collective response, yet contained in the realms of the domestic and the local) to a diverse repertoire of mediated and unmediated communication and information sharing (in which collective power and individual action are mutually shaped and often extend beyond domestic and local boundaries). These shifts are clear in all the domains included in this volume, though the ways in which people are positioned, or position themselves, in particular domains varies considerably. A new focus on mediation, rather than on media themselves, invites a new phase of critical and empirical examination for new media researchers.

## HOW TO USE THE UPDATED STUDENT EDITION

With this Updated Student Edition of the *Handbook*, we depart from the usual model in academic publishing of simply reproducing the first edition in soft cover. Nor have we put together an entirely new second edition. The book still provides a current and comprehensive introduction for non-specialist colleagues and advanced students who are new to the field, as well as a reference for new media scholars. However, this edition of the *Handbook* is aimed primarily at students and instructors teaching at the upper-division undergraduate or introductory graduate level, either as a primary text or as required background reading that provides more depth and range than is possible with more superficial textbook treatments. For this edition we have selected contributions from the first edition that provide the most clearly structured overviews of major

concepts and issues in new media studies. The authors have revised and updated their chapters in light of the most recent scholarship and developments in their respective specialties.

As noted earlier, we have reorganized and streamlined the original six sections into three broad areas that address culture and society, system design and industries, and institutions and governance, respectively. Each chapter focuses on a single key issue, concept or set of related questions, and each combines an overview of foundational literature with a conceptual organization or framework to help put the literature in larger perspective. Introductory courses might cover all three areas, for example; more advanced syllabi might focus just on one or two. Alternatively, instructors might choose their own selection of chapters according to the requirements of their particular programmes or specializations.

One reason we have taken this approach is that most students enrolling in new media studies courses today have grown up with the technologies and are already sophisticated users of mobile phones, personal computers, PDAs, wireless networks, and so on. Many author and host their own web pages and blogs, download music, video, and mobile phone ring-tones, play online games, chat online with or send text messages to family and friends, make long distance phone calls via the Internet, shop for everything online from clothing to textbooks, organize and participate in political and cultural groups via technology. Their technical sophistication is far greater than that of students ten or even five years ago.

What students are often missing, however, is a familiarity with the historical, economic, social or behavioural context of the technologies they use every day and take for granted. They lack the knowledge and background that would enable them to think critically about new media – where they come from, how they're used, who benefits and who is disadvantaged by the ways that systems are configured and run. The overviews provided here can help students understand more about their own communication and the devices they use to do it, as well as give them a base of

knowledge to help frame their future choices and uses of media.

We have asked chapter authors to identify and draw out the key debates and problems in their fields, in the context of their various intellectual and disciplinary traditions. Therefore, the student of new media should also pay keen attention to relations among the chapters and the sections. Do the different authors agree with each other, and are their views mutually compatible, therefore 'filling in' the picture of new media studies for a particular domain? Or do they present the reader with competing visions of new media studies that require the reader to choose which author to follow, which route to take through the tangle of alternate accounts?

For example, Nancy Baym's chapter on interpersonal relations online shares some themes with Nicholas Jankowski's chapter about how new media facilitate community-building. The student of new media might ask whether Baym's micro-level analysis, focused on interpersonal communication and relationships, fits well with Jankowski's meso-level approach, focused on groups and collectives (Alexander et al., 1987). Do they draw similar or different conclusions about mediated relationships, about the future research agenda, even about the most productive research methods? Are similar methods used and results found when mediated relationships are studied within organizations, as in the chapter by Andrea Hollingshead and Noshir Contractor? Does their focus on 'networks' offer a more useful framework for research than, say, 'communities' or 'relationships'?

Similar questions apply when sections of the volume are compared. For example, in Part One, David Buckingham sees children as uniquely individual new media users, even pioneers, in the digital age. Stefaan Verhulst's chapter in Part Three traces the regulatory frameworks that are intended to empower and protect the public as they encounter new media, especially the Internet. Children, or legal minors, are frequently thought of as more vulnerable to the dangers of indecent or violent media than other groups and thus in need of such protective laws. But is the picture of children as vulnerable targets consistent with

the depiction of them as heterogeneous, pleasure-seeking, and participatory, presented in Buckingham's chapter? Do either of these authors, from their different perspectives, take into account the three forms of interactivity that Sally McMillan proposes in Part Two? Or, perhaps, do they add to or elaborate her classification by focusing on even newer forms of interactive media? We encourage students to undertake a critical and comparative reading across the chapters and sections of the *Handbook*: the outcome is likely to be both unpredictable and stimulating.

Students and instructors alike should also consider the ideas that we (Lievrouw and Livingstone) have presented in this introduction and in the 'Introduction to the First Edition'. We have proposed that new media differ from mass media in terms of the recombinant and networked ways they develop, and their ubiquitous and interactive consequences. How, and to what extent, are these four themes reflected in the other chapters? Where and how should we look for evidence of recombination, the network metaphor, ubiquity or interactivity? Have we left out other characteristics that might be just as (or more) important? What are the comparable characteristics of mass media? Based on the record of new media research, we also take the position that communication studies should shift its primary focus from mass media to the mediation process itself. Do you agree? Should mass and new media be studied differently, that is, using different theories and research methods? If so, which theories and methods are best in each case?

We close this edition of the *Handbook* with a chapter by Frank Webster, a prominent 'new media sceptic'. Like several of the other chapter authors, Webster is rightly wary of hyperbolic claims made for new media and the breathless language of 'cyber', 'hyper', 'wired', and 'virtual' that are so often invoked by governments, technologists, industries and in popular culture. As we said previously, new media research has been strongly influenced by theories of post-industrial, postmodern, and information society; Webster sets some tough standards for deciding whether the 'information society' has actually arrived. He suggests that if we look at

large-scale economic processes, rather than the customized, personal, interactive experience of 'going online', contemporary society remains crucially hierarchical. Like some of the other authors here, and in line with a longstanding 'continuity' perspective in critical communication research regarding the information society (Schement and Lievrouw, 1987; Schiller, 1981; Turow, 1990), he insists that questions of power, resources and inequality still matter. Readers should test their ideas against this argument as well.

We wish to make one final point about the role research and scholarship can or should play in social change. A persistent theme running through new media studies, and in popular culture generally, is the pace and even urgency of social and technological change associated with ICTs. The hype surrounding new media is usually enough to generate a sceptical response from the academy: there are genuine difficulties in knowing social change when we see it, and in measuring and evaluating it when we do. But this caution also presents a challenge for new media researchers who seek to critique, intervene, or otherwise influence the political and economic management of new media. Just as we must not bypass conventional standards of intellectual and empirical rigour in our assessments of new media, neither should the academy itself risk being bypassed by neglecting questions about new media when they rise to the top of public and policy agendas. This is not simply a matter of the trade-off between academic standards and timely policy intervention; it also reflects the long-standing debate within media and communication studies between so-called administrative and critical traditions of research (Lazarfield, 1941; Levy and Gurevitch, 1994; see also *Ferment in the Field*, 1983). Ultimately, new media researchers must ask: is it the responsibility of research actively to shape social and technological change? Or is it more appropriate to evaluate the social shaping process independently, from a distance? Should new media research produce knowledge in order to inform or to critique the strategic activities of powerful or established interests? How will the public interest be served?



## NOTES

1. As, of course, were *production, text, and audience* – yet the effect of the administrative research tradition in communication studies was to detach these phenomena from the contexts that constituted them.

2. For more on network externalities, see Lievrouw, in this volume. For a concise explanation of cumulative advantage processes and power laws, especially in relation to the Internet, see Huberman (2000).

3. Here MacKenzie and Wajcman's (1999) distinction between technological determinism as a theory of technology and as a theory of society proves useful. As the former, technological determinism clearly fails: technological innovation is a thoroughly social process, from conception, design, production, marketing, diffusion, appropriation, use and consequences. But as a theory of society and social change, one may agree with MacKenzie and Wajcman (1999: 3) that technological determinism contains 'a partial truth'. In other words, provided it is firmly understood that technologies are social products which embed human relations in their very constitution, we may – for convenience in our arguments and discussion – cast them in the role of actors, along with other kinds of actor, when explaining social processes, whether education, political life, childhood, labour and so forth. But this is only a shorthand, for 'precisely because technological determinism is partly right as a theory of society (technology matters not just physically and biologically, but also to our human relations to each other), its deficiency as a theory of technology impoverishes the political life of our societies' (1999: 5).

4. It can be argued that historically, the single exception related to mass media has been print literacy and reading, long considered a prerequisite to economic, social and political participation, self-efficacy, and self-determination in developed Western societies. The basic necessity and 'right' of literacy thus underpins publicly funded education, libraries and postal services. In recent years the language of literacy and reading has been appropriated to discuss other types of media use and consumption, and thus to draw parallels between literacy and other types of communication and information skills, and thus the 'right' to those other skills (see e.g. Kellner, 2002; Kress, 2003; Livingstone, 2004a; Luke, 1989; Manguel, 1996; Snyder, 1998). Analogously, access to the telephone system has been framed in terms of universal service in the US since the 1934 Communications Act, but telephony has not been considered a mass medium, or indeed a 'medium' at all, in communication studies until relatively recently (Sawhney and Barnett, 1999).

## REFERENCES

- Abercrombie, N. and Longhurst, B. (1998) *Audiences: A Sociological Theory of Performance and Imagination*. London: Sage.
- Agre, P. (2004) 'Internet research: For and against', in M. Consalvo et al. (eds), *Internet Research Annual*, Volume 1. New York: Peter Lang, pp. 25–36.
- Alexander, J.C., Giesen, B., Munch, R. and Smelser, N.J. (eds) (1987) *The Micro-macro Link*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Ang, I. (1990) *Desperately Seeking the Audience*. London: Routledge.
- Appadurai, A. (1996) *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ball-Rokeach, S.J. and Reardon, K. (1988) 'Monologue, dialogue, and telelog: Comparing an emergent form of communication with traditional forms', in R.P. Hawkins, J.M. Wiemann, and S. Pingree (eds), *Advancing Communication Science: Merging Mass and Interpersonal Processes*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, pp. 135–61.
- Boczkowski, P.J. (2004) *Digitizing the News: Innovation in Online Newspapers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Boczkowski, P. and Lievrouw, L.A. (forthcoming) 'Bridging S&TS and communication studies: Research on media and information technologies', in E.J. Hackett, O. Amsterdamska, M. Lynch, and J. Wajcman (eds), *New Handbook of Science and Technology Studies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bolter, J.D. and Grusin, R. (1999) *Remediation: Understanding New Media*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bryant, J. and Street, R.L. Jr. (1988) 'From reactivity to activity and action: An evolving concept and *Weltanschauung* in mass and interpersonal communication', in R.P. Hawkins, J.M. Wiemann and S. Pingree (eds), *Advancing Communication Science: Merging Mass and Interpersonal Processes*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, pp. 162–90.
- Bucy, E.P. and Newhagen, J.E. (eds) (2004) *Media Access: Social and Psychological Dimensions of New Technology Use*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Castells, M. (2002) *The Internet Galaxy: Reflections on the Internet, Business, and Society*. Oxford: OUP.
- Coleman, S. (2004) 'Blogs as listening posts rather than soapboxes', in R. Ferguson and M. Howell (eds), *Political Blogs: Craze or Convention*. London: Hansard Society.
- Compaine, B.M. (ed.) (2001) *The Digital Divide: Facing a Crisis or Creating a Myth?* Cambridge MA and London: MIT Press.
- Ferment in the Field (1983) Special issue of the *Journal of Communication*, 33 (3), summer.
- Fornas, J. (2002) 'Passages across thresholds: Into the borderlands of mediation', *Convergence*, 8 (4): 89–106.

- Gandy, O.H. (2002) 'The real digital divide: Citizens versus consumers', in L. Lievrouw and S. Livingstone (eds) *Handbook of New Media*. London: Sage, pp. 448–600.
- Gee, J.P. (2003) *What Video Games Have to Teach Us About Learning and Literacy*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Golding, P. (2000) 'Forthcoming features: Information and communications technologies and the sociology of the future', *Sociology*, 34 (1): 165–84.
- Gray, A. (1999) 'Audience and reception research in retrospect: The trouble with audiences', in P. Alasuutari (ed.), *Rethinking the Media Audience*. London: Sage, pp. 22–37.
- Hartley, J. (1988) 'The real world of audiences', *Critical Response*, 5 (3): 234–43.
- Huberman, B.A. (2000) *The Laws of the Web: Patterns in the Ecology of Information*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kellner, D. (2002) 'New media and new literacies: Reconstructing education for the new millennium', in L.A. Lievrouw and S. Livingstone (eds), *The Handbook of New Media: Social Shaping and Consequences of ICTs*. London: Sage, pp. 90–104.
- Kress, G. (2003) *Literacy in the New Media Age*. London: Routledge.
- Latour, B. (1991) 'Technology is society made durable', in J. Law (ed.), *A Sociology of Monsters: Essays on Power, Technology and Domination*. London: Routledge, pp. 103–31.
- Lazarfeld, P.F. (1941) 'Remarks on administrative and critical communication research', *Studies in Philosophy and Social Science*, 9: 2–16.
- Levy, M.R. and Gurevitch, M. (eds) (1994) *Defining Media Studies: Reflections on the Future of the Field*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lievrouw, L.A. (2000) 'The information environment and universal service', *The Information Society*, 16 (2): 155–9.
- Lievrouw, L.A. (2001) 'New media and the "pluralization of life-worlds": A role for information in social differentiation', *New Media and Society*, 3 (1): 7–28.
- Lievrouw, L.A. (2004) 'What's changed about new media? Introduction to the fifth anniversary issue', *New Media & Society*, 6 (1): 9–15.
- Lievrouw, L.A. and Farb, S.E. (2003) 'Information and social equity', *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*, 37: 499–540.
- Lievrouw, L.A. and Finn, T.A. (1990) 'Identifying the common dimensions of communication: the Communication Systems Model', in Brent D. Ruben and Leah A. Lievrouw (eds), *Mediation, Information and Communication: Information and Behavior*, volume 3. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, pp. 37–65.
- Lievrouw, L.A. and Livingstone, S. (2002) 'Introduction: The social shaping and consequences of new media', in L.A. Lievrouw and S. Livingstone (eds), *Handbook of New Media: Social Shaping and Consequences of ICTs*. London: Sage, pp. 1–15.
- Light, J. (2001) 'Rethinking the digital divide', *Harvard Educational Review*, 71 (4): 710–34.
- Ling, R. (2004) *The Mobile Connection: The Cell Phone's Impact on Society*. San Francisco: Elsevier.
- Livingstone, S. (2002) *Young People and New Media: Childhood and the Changing Media Environment*. London: Sage.
- Livingstone, S. (2004a) 'Media literacy and the challenge of new information and communication technologies', *Communication Review*, 7: 3–14.
- Livingstone, S. (2004b) 'The challenge of changing audiences: Or, what is the audience researcher to do in the internet age?', *European Journal of Communication*, 19 (1): 75–86.
- Livingstone, S. (ed.) (2005) *Audiences and Publics: When Cultural Engagement Matters for the Public Sphere*. Bristol: Intellect Press.
- Livingstone, S. (in press) 'Critical debates in internet studies: Reflections on an emerging field', in J. Curran and M. Gurevich (eds), *Mass Media and Society*, 4th edn. London: HodderArnold.
- Loader, B. (ed.) (1998) *Cyberspace Divide: Equality, Agency and Policy in the Information Society*. London: Routledge.
- Luke, C. (1989) *Pedagogy, Printing and Protestantism: The Discourse of Childhood*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- MacKenzie, D. and Wajcman, J. (eds) (1999) *The Social Shaping of Technology*, 2nd edn. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Manguel, A. (1996) *A History of Reading*. New York: Penguin.
- Manovich, L. (2001) *The Language of New Media*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- McLuhan, M. (1964) *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Murdock, G. (2002) 'Review Article: Debating digital divides', *European Journal of Communication*, 17 (3): 385–90.
- National Telecommunications and Information Administration (1995, July) *Falling Through the Net: A Survey of 'Have Nots' in Rural and Urban America*. Washington, DC: United States Department of Commerce. URL (consulted April 13, 2005): <http://www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/fallingthru.html>.
- National Telecommunications and Information Administration (1998, July) *Falling Through the*

- Net II: New Data on the Digital Divide*. Washington, DC: United States Department of Commerce. URL (consulted April 13, 2005): <http://www.ntia.doc.gov/ntiahome/net2/falling.html>.
- Norris, P. (2001) *Digital Divide: Civic Engagement, Information Poverty, and the Internet Worldwide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Poster, M. (1990) *The Mode of Information: Poststructuralism and Social Control*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Rafaeli, S. (1988) 'Interactivity: From new media to communication', in R.P. Hawkins, J.M. Wiemann and S. Pingree (eds), *Advancing Communication Science: Merging Mass and Interpersonal Processes*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, pp. 110–34.
- Reeves, B. and Nass, C. (1996) *The Media Equation: How People Treat Computers, Television and New Media Like Real People and Places*. Stanford, CA: CSLI, and Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rice, R.E. and Associates (eds) (1984) *The New Media: Communication, Research and Technology*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Rogers, E.M. (1986) *Communication Technology: The New Media in Society*. New York: Free Press.
- Rogers, E.M. and Kincaid, D.L. (1981) *Communication Networks: Toward a New Paradigm for Research*. New York: Free Press.
- Sawhney, H. and Barnett, G.A. (eds) (1999) *Progress in Communication Sciences, Vol. XV: Advances in Telecommunications*. Stamford, CT: Ablex.
- Schement, J.R. and Lievrouw, L.A. (1987) 'The fundamental assumptions of information society research', in J.R. Schement and L.A. Lievrouw (eds), *Competing Visions, Complex Realities: Social Aspects of the Information Society*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, pp. 1–10.
- Schiller, H.I. (1981) *Who Knows: Information in the Age of the Fortune 500*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Selwyn, N. (2004) 'Reconsidering political and popular understandings of the digital divide', *New Media and Society*, 6 (3): 341–62.
- Silverstone, R. (2005) 'Mediation and communication', in Craig Calhoun, Chris Rojek and Bryan S. Turner (eds), *International Handbook of Sociology*. London: Sage.
- Smythe, D. (1981) 'On the audience commodity and its work', in *Dependency Road: Communications, Capitalism, Consciousness, and Canada*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, pp. 22–51.
- Stone, A.R. (1995) *The War of Desire and Technology at the Close of the Mechanical Age*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Turow, J. (1990) 'The critical importance of mass communication as a concept', in B. Rubin and L.A. Lievrouw (eds), *Mediation, Information, and Communication: Information and Behavior*, volume 2. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, pp. 9–19.
- Verhulst, S. (2005) Analysis into the Social Implication of Mediation by Emerging Technologies. Draft position paper for the MIT-OII Joint Workshop, *New Approaches to Research on the Social Implications of Emerging Technologies*. Oxford Internet Institute, University of Oxford, April 15–16, 2005. <http://www.oii.ox.ac.uk>
- Warschauer, M. (2003) *Technology and Social Inclusion: Rethinking the Digital Divide*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Wellman, B. (2004) 'The three ages of Internet studies: Ten, five and zero years ago', *New Media and Society*, 6 (1): 123–9.
- Wellman, B., and Haythornwaite, C. (2002) *The Internet in Everyday Life*. London: Blackwell.
- Williams, R. (1974) *Television: Technology and Cultural Form*. London: Fontana.
- Woolgar, S. (2002) 'Five rules of virtuality', in S. Woolgar (ed.), *Virtual Society? Technology, Cyberbole, Reality*. Oxford: OUP, pp. 1–22.

# Introduction to the First Edition (2002)

## The Social Shaping and Consequences of ICTs

LEAH A. LIEVROUW AND SONIA LIVINGSTONE

As this is being written, ‘new media’ is a buzzword, shorthand for a volatile cultural and technology industry that includes multimedia, entertainment and e-commerce. However, in social research the term has a long history, having been used since the 1960s and 1970s by investigators studying the forms, uses and implications of information and communication technologies (ICTs) (e.g. Parker, 1970a; 1973b; Parker and Dunn, 1972). As our contributor and International Advisory Board member Ron Rice pointed out in his foundational collection, *The New Media* (1984), behind the usual meaning of gadgets and trends lie multilayered relationships among economic, political, behavioural, cultural and institutional as well as technological phenomena. Social researchers, critics, historians and designers have all sought to understand them.

A quick visit to a bookstore (online or ‘live’) immediately reveals the scatter of new-media-related research and scholarship across what are often Balkanized literatures. Any new research front, especially one that is ‘transdisciplinary’, undergoes an initial period of exploration and expansion. Scholars ask new questions, gather data that is often hard to characterize or manage, and borrow or invent all sorts of frameworks and models in attempts to speak meaningfully about what they find. The sheer diversity and proliferation can be exhilarating and liberating – and difficult to comprehend. Eventually, the pendulum swings back toward synthesis and efforts are made to find common threads or themes.

The present volume was conceived as a move in this direction for new media studies. However, our goal is not to create fixed boundaries for the area, to dictate a canonical literature, or even to argue for a single coherent speciality. Rather, we believe that the continuing openness of new media research, after decades of growth and diversity, continues to be one of its most compelling and productive strengths. Its transdisciplinary goals and structure are entirely appropriate at this moment in Western intellectual history, though they may pose challenges to institutional and disciplinary conventions that are closer to the nineteenth century than the twenty-first.

In this volume, we have attempted to identify major research areas where substantial or influential work has already been done, and to suggest parallel themes or concerns that have surfaced within and among them. Our aim is to deal with the scatter by encouraging, for example, economists of information or technology to consider identity and gender as they are understood in cultural studies; by asking cultural historians to look at the psychology of media use; by persuading sociologists of social change to think about regulatory regimes; and by leading system designers to think about human geography.

Of course, to some extent this strategy only highlights a familiar fact of life for new media scholars: regardless of their disciplinary training or affiliations (ours happen to be in communication and information studies and in social psychology, respectively), we must read

and engage across multiple disciplines, whether scientific or humanist, interpretive or empirical. It is difficult, but essential, to be able to look across terminologies, descriptive and explanatory tools, illustrative cases, even assumptions about everyday life. (Happily, an outstanding synthesis like Castells' *Information Age* trilogy or Luhmann's *Social Systems* does occasionally arrive.) The task can be particularly fearsome for students or colleagues who are new to the area, and we have tried to keep these readers in mind as we organized the *Handbook*.

Given the pervasiveness and significance of media and communication technologies in contemporary society it may be surprising that no single volume has yet attempted to draw together the principal strands of research and scholarship that comprise the best current understanding of the relationship between new media and society. Certainly, the chapters and reference lists in this book testify that a huge body of relevant work has been published, particularly over the last 20 years. In the last five years alone perhaps a dozen new scholarly journals on the topic have been launched as venues for publishing research from many disciplines. And by the late 1990s, new media programmes and faculty could be found throughout the world.

Though the speciality dates back several decades, only in the 1990s was there a major impetus for dramatic expansion in the field. In many ways the recent growth of new media studies has coincided with that of the Internet, though of course it is by no means the only significant new media technology. Since the 1970s, when the first 'personal computers' were introduced and the ARPANET was built as an elite channel for technical communication, the Internet has become a platform for commerce, sociality and popular culture. At the same time, new media research has expanded from a handful of specialists in telecommunications regulation and policy, small-group processes, social network analysis, the social psychology of computing and media, organizational communication and 'man-machine studies' to become a major focus of research and scholarship in its own right. Only lately have large numbers of scholars been drawn to the field, creating the

need for a collection like this one which draws together so many diverse developments and identifies key themes and challenges for future research.

Therefore, in this introductory chapter we do several things to help frame contemporary social research and scholarship on new media as it is represented in the following chapters. First, we trace the research projects, problems and intellectual traditions that informed and set the stage for the beginnings of new media research. Second, we propose a definition for new media that acknowledges these early influences as well as the evolution of the field over the last couple of decades. Third, we identify and discuss several important characteristics that distinguish the 'social shaping and consequences' of new media. And fourth, we review some continuing issues and new developments in the methodology of new media research. Obviously, our approach cannot be exhaustive or definitive; instead, we offer observations that suggest the range of possible ways ahead. We end with some observations on the contents and organization of this volume.

## EARLY INFLUENCES ON NEW MEDIA RESEARCH

There is, inevitably, some arbitrariness in setting a starting point for any historical review. For new media studies, the problem is compounded because the area has always been multidisciplinary and international, so different fields and specialities have entered the scene at different times in different places.<sup>1</sup> Its early influences include research projects and initiatives that developed outside the mainstream of, or at the intersection among, the major disciplines. Each had its distinct concerns or problematics, or examined particular social phenomena or contexts, so collectively this early body of work tended to be a somewhat scattered response to the innovative information and communication technologies of that era. Nonetheless, many of these projects and studies have had a guiding influence on more recent research, and several of their



authors are contributors to, or members of the International Advisory Board for, the present volume. They continue to be cited and would be included in any 'core' bibliography of new media studies (for a more extensive overview, see Lievrouw et al., 2001).

For example, in economics, *Handbook* contributor and Board member Don Lamberton (1971), Kenneth Arrow (1979, 1984), Charles Jonscher (1983) and others worked out important conceptualizations of the economics of information. Their insights about information as an economic good or commodity laid the foundation for new understandings of intellectual property and of the value and significance of 'information work'. Fritz Machlup (1962) and Marc Porat (Porat and Rubin, 1977) conducted some of the first studies that identified and described the extent and significance of information work in the US. In 1978, Simon Nora and Alain Minc, *inspecteurs de finances* for the French government, issued their internationally cited report on the economic significance and challenge of *télématique* for French society (Nora and Minc, 1981 [1978]). Joseph Schumpeter's (1939) theories of 'long waves' of economic development were an important influence on information society theories (Shields and Samarajiva, 1993). *Handbook* Board member Youichi Ito and his collaborators at Keio University based their analysis of *johoka shakai*, or informationalized society, on measurements of the stocks and flows of information in Japan during the 1960s. Their *johoka* index incorporated the amount of information produced per year, the distribution of communication media, the quality of information activities, and a ratio of information expenditures as a proportion of total expenditures (Ito, 1981). This approach has continued to dominate information society analyses in Japan (Kurisaki and Yanagimachi, 1992).

In sociology, Daniel Bell's (1973) theory of 'post-industrial society' quickly became a point of departure for studies of information technologies and social change, though it was also widely criticized (for example, see Webster in this volume). Anthony Giddens (another of our Board members) analysed the changing

perceptions of space and time associated with information technology, and later, media as instruments of social surveillance and control in modern societies (Giddens, 1979; 1984). In an extensive historical study, James Beniger (1986) described the 'control revolution' facilitated by communication technologies from the nineteenth-century industrial era onward.

Social psychology provided many early insights into the uses of ICTs. In the UK, Short et al. (1976) proposed that teleconferencing systems could be evaluated in terms of their 'social presence'. Similarly, Robert Johansen and his colleagues (1979) at the Institute for the Future (near Stanford University) formulated the concept of 'telepresence' based on their studies of meetings conducted via video conferencing technology. At the New Jersey Institute of Technology, Roxanne Hiltz and Murray Turoff (1993 [1978]) conducted one of the earliest studies of interaction among geographically dispersed work groups of scientists and engineers via computer-mediated communication. Lee Sproull, Sara Kiesler and their students and colleagues at Carnegie-Mellon University were among the first to note the effects of the anonymity and 'reduced social context cues' of computer-based messaging, which, they argued, contribute to disinhibited communication and 'flaming' (Kiesler et al., 1984; Sproull and Kiesler, 1991). At the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Sherry Turkle observed both children and computer science students and faculty learning to program. Her seminal essay, 'Computer as Rorschach' (1980), and her subsequent book, *The Second Self* (1984), introduced the idea that computers are 'projective devices' that allow users to control many aspects of their self-presentation and interaction.

Important work was done by scholars in many other fields, including the political scientist Ithiel de Sola Pool (1977; 1983), telecommunications engineer Colin Cherry (1978 [1957]; 1985) and management expert Thomas J. Allen (1977). However, at the same time, while these other fields and disciplines responded to changes in modes of communication and information technology that they had previously taken for granted, communication

research was also developing, constituting a central plank of new media studies. Indeed, the moment when the mass communication research literature developed an identifiable interest in 'new media' coincided with the break up of mass media in the 1970s, as broadcasting converged with digital telecommunications, information systems and computing (e.g. Parker, 1973a). Therefore, interest in new media, especially within the communication discipline, was inextricably tied up with the transformation of 'old' mass media from the outset. These transformations were thought to be associated with the evolution of mass society into a service-based 'information society', or alternatively a more differentiated, perhaps fragmented, perhaps more heterarchical, network society.

In this context, some mass media researchers began to redirect their attention to newer technologies and channels that did not fit the conventional 'mass' framework. Such channels, including the telephone, videotex, audio and video teleconferencing, photocopying, facsimile, and computer-mediated communication (CMC) via the fledgling ARPANET and other systems, had been neglected because they did not fit easily into either the mass media or interpersonal/speech communication specialties within communication research (Rogers, 1999). They also lay outside the main theoretical and methodological concerns of other social science and humanities disciplines. Of these technologies, only the telephone had a major presence in the home; researchers often had to study the others within the settings of the universities, government agencies or other large organizations where they were used.

Therefore, and doubtless for reasons to do with the availability of research funding and the 'applied' or 'administrative' nature of the questions being asked (Lazarsfeld, 1941; Melody and Mansell, 1983), many early studies of new media technologies within communication research took a somewhat traditional approach, considering the 'impacts' of new technologies on attitudes, behaviour, organizations, policy and so on. They focused on workers' perceptions of new technologies, the features and functions of different systems, the

types of communication or information services that the systems supported, and their 'effects' on work performance and productivity. Policy studies considered the implications of new media for different industry structures and regulatory options, or described changes in employment and occupational structures attributable to the rise of new technologies and 'information industries'. They examined the prospects for extending established frameworks for universal service obligations, cross-subsidies, rate regulation, and decency and privacy laws to new media systems. In short, a broadly administrative response to technological innovation, modelled primarily after the mass communication 'effects' tradition, came to dominate the field of new media research at an early stage, particularly in the US.

At Stanford University, for example, Edwin Parker and his associates explored the uses of computing for information retrieval and 'information utilities' (Parker, 1970b; 1973b). They also studied the effects of new technologies (such as slow-scan television, direct broadcast satellites and telephone systems) on what was then termed 'development communication' (Parker, 1978). Parker, *Handbook* Board member Everett Rogers, and others examined the role of new media technologies in social and economic development, applying diffusion of innovations theory to the provision of social and information services to rural or underserved areas and nations (Parker and Hudson, 1975; Parker and Mohammadi, 1977; Rogers, 1995; see also Heather Hudson's chapter in this volume). In Canada, government initiatives on computer-mediated communication and videotex in the 1970s produced clusters of new media researchers in Québec and elsewhere. By the early 1980s, the Annenberg School for Communication at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles had become a centre for new media research grounded in the social psychology of telecommunications, organizational communication, and communication law and policy.

The European tradition of new media research took a rather different direction in the beginning, emphasizing a cultural/critical studies approach to media content and industries, on



the one hand, and a broadly Marxist political economy of media, on the other.<sup>2</sup> Just as the different theoretical, philosophical, methodological and political commitments of administrative and critical (or, variously, 'positivist' and 'relativist', or 'quantitative' and 'qualitative') research were being explicitly debated in media and communication research more generally (see e.g. *Ferment in the Field*, 1983), new media research underwent a similar divergence of its own. Eschewing the preference for middle-range theory that characterized administrative research (Boudon, 1991), European scholars on the whole became more critical of new media than their US counterparts (with some exceptions, noted below). They drew upon a variety of social theories, ranging from Bourdieu's analysis of the relation between economy and culture (Bourdieu, 1977 [1972]; 1980) to Foucault's linking of technology to the administrative imperatives, standardization processes and procedures of bureaucratic organization (Foucault, 1970 [1966]; 1980). Social theories of modernity and social change, including Bell's post-industrial society, Habermas' theory of the public sphere and Giddens' theory of structuration, also inspired new theoretical approaches that connected new media technologies to the co-determination of social structure and action.

British media studies, for example, took an explicitly cultural/critical approach to new media, as they had to mass media previously. Raymond Williams (1974) was a key figure in this tradition, not only in establishing a critical approach to the mass media, contextualizing them in relation to both political economy and cultural analysis, but also in developing the relation between studies of mass communication and the study of technology and technological innovation. This perspective carried over into early studies of new media content and industry structure in the UK and Europe and has, more recently, also stimulated the study of the social and cultural contexts of ICT consumption and use (Jouet, 1994; Miller and Slater, 2000; Silverstone and Hirsch, 1992).

The political economy of media was another significant influence in European (and later, in North American) new media studies, especially

during the 1980s as critics mounted a response to post-industrialism and the popular vision of the 'information society' promulgated by industry and government. As argued by *Handbook* contributor Frank Webster and Kevin Robins (Robins and Webster, 1985; Webster, 1995; Webster and Robins, 1986; 1989) and Nicholas Garnham (1986; 1990; 1994), among others, new media systems and services tend to reinforce the economic and political power of existing systems and institutions. In effect, they argued, the information society is the latest stage of industrial capitalism, not a radical departure from the past.

This critique of the cultural, economic and political power of mass media was advanced forcefully by a number of European scholars, including *Handbook* Board members Armand Mattelart in France, and Cees Hamelink, Tapio Varis and Osmo Wiio in Finland. It was also well represented in North America by the late Herb Schiller and his colleagues at the University of California, San Diego (Schiller, 1981), George Gerbner at the University of Pennsylvania's Annenberg School for Communication, and Dallas Smythe and his research group at Simon Fraser University in Canada. Their colleagues and students carried the critical perspective forward to studies of new media content, ownership structures and technology development (see e.g. Gandy, 1993; Mosco, 1982, 1996; Schiller, 1982; Slack and Fejes, 1987).

These and related perspectives provided the key framework for the development of new media research in the UK. Central to this development was the decision, in 1985, of the Economic and Social Research Council to provide ten years of funding for the first coordinated research Programme on Information and Communication Technologies (PICT) (which was succeeded by the Virtual Society? Programme headed by *Handbook* Board member Steve Woolgar, followed in turn by the E-Society Programme). This multimillion-pound research programme not only served to make visible the various strands of research on new media already developed in the UK, but also drew on a wide array of academic disciplines to establish what has become a burgeoning tradition of new media research in the UK.

Combining critical and empirical approaches, the PICT legacy in particular is that of an active, policy-oriented research community committed to a broadly 'social shaping' position, concerned to understand and critique how governments, regions, organizations and households are shaping as well as being shaped by technological developments in the field of new media (for an overview of PICT-related research, see the edited volume by our Board member Bill Dutton, 1996).

While some observers have asked how far mass communication theory can be extended to the new media (e.g. McQuail, 1986; Morris and Ogan, 1996), the effects-type approach is still found in new media research in many countries (e.g. Lea, 1992; Reeves and Nass, 1996). Today, however, it is balanced by more complex levels of analysis and a more critical perspective that locate the changing perceptions and practices surrounding new media within a broader institutional, economic and cultural context.

Nonetheless, there are some 'blind spots'. For example, international and comparative studies are still relatively scarce. The new media research traditions of non-Western countries remain less familiar to, and so less influential for, the largely English-language scholars and literature we have traced here. It is fair to say that, until very recently, rather more comparative literature has been produced concerning traditional mass media (e.g. Blumler et al., 1992; Chaffee and Chu, 1992; Lull, 1988) than new media, though there are notable exceptions (such as George Barnett's world-systems theory approach to international telephone uses and networks: Barnett and Choi, 1995; Barnett and Salisbury, 1996). Several major international bodies, such as UNESCO, OECD and the European Commission, collate national- and regional-level data that are used in comparative studies (UNESCO, 2000).

In part, this limited 'internationalization' of the field reflects the flows and connections among research communities cross-nationally. It demonstrates that new media themselves have developed and diffused according to different time-scales in different places, which is largely though not exclusively a matter of

economics. Only recently, for instance, since 'Europe' expanded its borders after 1989, has there been research on new media within the context of ex-Soviet countries (Lengel, 2000). Within Europe in particular, however, pan-European work has burgeoned, stimulated by the increasingly unified European economic and policy community (e.g. Becker and Schoenbach, 1989; Livingstone and Bovill, 2001; McQuail et al., 1986; Robins and Morley, 1989; Schultz, 1992; Tydeman and Kelm, 1986). This policy-oriented research, which is informed by Habermas' theory of the public sphere in particular, reflects a formative trend in new media research at both the national and pan-European level, and contrasts with a great deal of US policy research. It has arisen in response to a growing sense that the strong public service tradition in European media is being undermined by changes within the European media environment (Burgelman, 1997; Calabrese and Burgelman, 1999; Ferguson, 1986; ).

As new media research has progressed from its early efforts to its recent proliferation in the 1990s, it has become more specialized; some of that variety is illustrated by the diverse chapters that follow. However, today this drift toward specialization is being challenged by broader developments in social theory. For example, as sociologists, political scientists, economists and others debate phenomena like globalization (e.g. Beck, Giddens, Luhmann), they often assume but rarely focus on or theorize the central role of ICTs in these hotly contested, incompletely global transformations in politics, economics and culture. Today, new media researchers face the new and important challenge of making their concepts, arguments and findings count, and having their theories and methods taken seriously, in this wider playing field.

## WHAT IS/ARE NEW MEDIA?

The thumbnail history outlined above provides a sense of just how many points of entry there have been to new media research, and the many ways in which new media might be

defined. The field needs a definition that is abstract enough to accommodate the range of systems, contents, issues and settings that researchers consider essential, yet not so broad that new media cannot be distinguished from other established areas within communication research and other disciplines.

At the risk of oversimplification, we can say that researchers concerned with technological, economic, or behavioural issues have tended to define new media in terms of system features and services, industry structures and ownership, or the psychology of media users, respectively. Critical/cultural scholars, following the media studies tradition, have drawn more on definitions based on new media content and its forms.

Undoubtedly, most definitions of new media and ICTs to date have focused on their technological features. Wilbur Schramm (1977) classified communication media on the basis of channel characteristics that parallel human sensory perception, such as motion versus still visuals, sound versus silent, text versus picture, or one-way (simplex) versus two-way (duplex) transmission. He distinguished between inexpensive, small-scale 'little media' and 'big media' with large, complex, expensive infrastructures and organizational arrangements. Ithiel de Sola Pool, a political scientist and pioneer of new media research, defined *new communications technologies* as 'shorthand for about 25 main devices', which he duly listed (Pool, 1990: 19). Other definitions of new media technology have taken a similar classificatory approach (Durlak, 1987; Steuer, 1995).

Ron Rice stressed the two-way capabilities of computing and telecommunications, and defined new media as 'those communication technologies, typically involving computer capabilities (microprocessor or mainframe), that allow or facilitate interactivity among users or between users and information' (Rice and Associates, 1984: 35). The demassified, time-shifting features of new media have been contrasted with the one-to-many, one-way message flows of traditional mass media (Rogers, 1986). More recently, writers have emphasized the convergence of computing and telecommunications technologies (Baldwin et al., 1996).

Studies of human-computer interaction and interface design focus on system features that affect the perceptions and cognitive 'human factors' of technology users (Reeves and Nass, 1996).

Consistent with this orientation toward system features, user perceptions and the mass media effects tradition in US communication research (especially the Shannon-Weaver linear model of communication that includes channel as a variable in the communication process), early studies of new media tended toward technological determinism. They emphasized the effects or 'impacts' of ICTs *on* users, organizations and societies. Technological determinism – the belief that technologies have an overwhelming and inevitable power to drive human actions and social change – is often taken for granted in technologically advanced societies. The opposing 'social shaping of technology' approach (see Lievrouw in this volume) contends that technologies are continuously remade by the things users do with them. Some technologies certainly constrain action, but people can always make choices about using them.

While many new media scholars today have developed a view of technology that is closer to the social shaping perspective, and despite the somewhat relentless critique of technological determinism over the last two decades, the language of 'impacts' persists in both academic research and popular culture (Kling, 1999; MacKenzie and Wajcman, 1999; Smith and Marx, 1994). Yet, as Raymond Williams (1974) forcefully pointed out, the link between technological determinism and narratives of progress (or, less commonly, narratives of decline) – narratives which cast science (typically allied to commercial imperatives) as the driver of not only technological innovation but also social change, with 'improvements' in technology becoming readily aligned with 'progress' in society – can be misleading or even dangerous.

For example, as several of our contributors point out, the Internet is popularly portrayed as a single medium which sprung fully formed into our lives less than a decade ago. However, this is misleading in two senses. First, 'the Internet' is shorthand for a bundle of different

media and modalities – e-mail, websites, news-groups, e-commerce and so forth – that make it perhaps the most complex and plural of the electronic media yet invented. Second, these different modes have their own communication characteristics, are subject to differing economic and social conditions of use and, significantly, have different histories stretching back over several decades. Clearly, these differences must be accounted for; they undermine any possibility of identifying singular impacts or effects because the (plural) meanings and consequences of the Internet are contingent on a wide range of specific historical and cultural conditions.

The dangers of defining communication media in terms of system features or ‘impacts’ are also illustrated by recent debates in American media law and regulation. Traditionally, media systems have been regulated in the US according to their technological configurations or infrastructures. Speech and publishing are largely unregulated (that is, their content cannot be censored) because historically those forms of communication are protected under the First Amendment of the US Constitution (though exceptions include pornography, libel and defamation, and speech that incites violence). First Amendment protection has been extended to other recording media as well, such as photography, film, audio and video, on the grounds that they too constitute ‘speech’.

The American telephone system (essentially AT&T and a few smaller operators), in contrast, was regulated under the Communications Act of 1934 as a ‘common carrier’, a concept borrowed from transportation law. The common carrier metaphor suggested that because the telephone system was a natural monopoly, AT&T should be required to serve any customers who were willing to pay, without regard for the content of their messages. Broadcasting was also regulated under the 1936 Act because the ‘airwaves’ (like water, perhaps) were a scarce resource that should be rationed because there were fewer radio (and later, television) frequencies available than broadcasters who wanted to use them. Broadcast licences were awarded to owners of radio and television stations whose programmes would serve the

‘public interest, convenience and necessity’ – and could be revoked if licensees aired material that did not meet this deliberately vague requirement.

Today technological convergence has blurred these channel-based metaphors – speech, transportation, airwaves – with serious consequences for the regulatory schemes that invoke them (First Amendment, common carriage, licensing). For example, though American Internet users often assume that they have First Amendment speech rights online, or expect the same level of privacy that they have for telephone calls, Internet service providers insist that they are entitled to intercept, read and censor any messages that pass through their systems because they may be held financially and legally liable for those communications. Employees who might reasonably assume that their books, papers and other print materials are safe from ‘unreasonable search and seizure’ find that similar privacy protections do not always extend to computer disks or hard drives. ‘Content providers’ like newspaper and book publishers, movie studios, and record companies, on the other hand, maintain that they should have the same rights of expression (and property rights) online as they do in print or on film. In response to recent technological developments and pressures from the media industries, the US Telecommunications Act of 1996 rolled back or weakened many of the rules of the 1934 Act. These include restrictions on cross-ownership of broadcast and publishing media, and the number of outlets that a single owner may have in a given market. While the 1996 Act does not solve all of the regulatory or equity problems of new media, the current regulatory climate shows that it is obviously becoming more difficult to distinguish among media, or to regulate them, on the basis of system features or technology alone.

### **Beyond Features**

No wonder, then, that contemporary discussions of new media have begun to incorporate more than technological characteristics. For the inaugural issue of the journal *New Media & Society*

(What's New about New Media?, 1999, a theme since revisited in a special issue of *New Media & Society* on the topic, 'What's Changed About New Media?' in 2004), editors asked several scholars (including one of the present authors) to respond to the question: what is 'new' about new media? What distinguishes them from other media, either technologically or socially? Some contributors mentioned channel characteristics or features like those reviewed above, or commented on the historical problem of labelling any technology as 'new' by definition. But others pointed out that new technologies give users an unprecedented ability to modify and redistribute content – contributing to what *Handbook* contributor Mark Poster called the 'underdetermination' of new media in comparison with traditional media. Rakow suggested that media research has not yet come to terms with the fact that new media allow any user to 'speak', an issue echoed by Sonia Livingstone's call for a reconceptualization of the notion of audience.

Kevin Robins, reviewing the recent work of Pierre Lévy, agreed that new media have produced a new kind of 'knowledge space' or 'communication space' that is 'de-referentialized', that is, disconnected from local, situated knowledge and experience. But unlike Lévy, who sees this development as an emancipatory break from older forms of knowledge that were linear, hierarchical and rigid, Robins argued that the new 'relation to knowledge' serves to further global corporate capitalism and the interests of a relatively small elite. In this environment, information and communication are valued not for their substance or meaning, but for their capacity to be processed, circulated, or connected for their own sake: 'contemporary knowledge culture is regarded as essentially about the acquisition of generic information skills and competencies' (1999: 20). In the same issue, Bill Melody proposed that new media are 'more influenced by economic factors' and more central to the new information economy than traditional media have been. The high degree of interconnectedness, and the volume of communication and information moving through networks, has created greater economic instability.

Insights like these bring us closer to a framework that more fully captures the rich interweaving of media technology, human action and social structure. While a single definition can hardly capture the variety of ways that the term is used today – or even in this book – we can still propose a framework for thinking about new media that goes beyond simple classification of systems and features. Therefore, by *new media* we mean information and communication technologies and their associated social contexts, incorporating:

- the artifacts or devices that enable and extend our abilities to communicate;
- the communication activities or practices we engage in to develop and use these devices; and
- the social arrangements or organizations that form around the devices and practices.

Together, we can think of the three aspects of media technology as an 'ensemble', in Michel Callon's phrase, or as infrastructure in the sense that Susan Leigh Star and Geof Bowker define it in this volume. The three elements are inextricable and mutually determining.

Clearly, from the viewpoint of this definition, many technologies are infrastructural, in that they combine elements of technology, practice and social organization. So what can we say distinguishes new media as a particular focus of study? Many apparently novel traits of new media have been described, including hyperreality, virtuality, anonymity, interactivity and so on. However, we believe that new media can be characterized more usefully in terms of, first, the particular ways that they are both the instrument and the product of social shaping and, second, their particular social consequences.

A number of the chapters here make the point that new media technologies both shape, and are shaped by, their social, economic and cultural contexts. More specifically for new media, however, such shaping is *recombinant*. That is, new media systems are products of a continuous hybridization of both existing technologies and innovations in interconnected technical and institutional networks. The recombinant/hybrid metaphor suggests that while ICTs are influenced by the existing technological context, and may have unintended



consequences, to a great extent they are the result of human actions and decisions. They are not determined by an independent, inevitable causality or evolutionary process unique to technology itself; rather, designers, users, regulators and others can take advantage of the current state of technical knowledge, and recombine technologies and new knowledge to achieve their particular goals or purposes.

The metaphor also suggests 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. Change, then, comes in waves or cycles; occasionally, a wave may be of such magnitude that it appears to be a 'revolution' or a complete break with the past, but from a longer perspective it is still part of an ongoing process.

Certainly, some media technologies may work so well, or be adopted so broadly, that they become very stable and resistant to change (for example, the NTSC television broadcast standard in the US). But in the last few decades, the social, political and economic premium placed on innovation, as well as the digitization of different media systems, have tended to push new media technologies toward instability. In this context, hybridization has created an unstable sociotechnical landscape and has compelled researchers to treat systems and their uses as moving targets (for example, the rapid coevolution of technologies and social groups that share audio and video over the Internet). This characteristic was first seen in the technological convergence of traditional media with computing and telecommunications that prompted the early studies within communication research and other fields in the 1960s and 1970s. It also accounts for the persistent sense of 'newness' that has been associated with media systems ever since.

Another specific aspect of social shaping associated with new media is that the point-to-point 'network' has become accepted as the archetypal form of contemporary social and technical organization. Today, the *network metaphor* applies not just to new media technologies, but also to the patterns of social

relations and organizing and the institutional formations associated with them. It can be argued that more traditional mass media technologies, as well as the organizations that employed them and the institutions that governed them, embodied industrial-era notions of social and work organization. For example, though broadcasting was often organized into systems called 'networks', such systems were usually hierarchical. This type of configuration supported the large-scale production and distribution of messages directed from a few media centres (ordinarily, major cities or cultural capitals) to 'mass' audiences. It ensured the smooth and rapid diffusion of information from the 'top' or 'centre' of the hierarchy to the bottom or periphery and provided little or no capacity for messages going the other way, so-called feedback. As it is understood today, however, the term 'network' denotes a broad, multiplex interconnection in which many points or 'nodes' (persons, groups, machines, collections of information, organizations) are embedded. Links among nodes may be created or abandoned on an as-needed basis at any location in the system, and any node can be either a sender or a receiver of messages – or both.

Certainly, high-tech firms, including new media services, tend to congregate in particular geographic places (the 'clusters' discussed by Cooke in this volume), and the network topographies of telecommunications, computing and media are far from evenly distributed around the world, or even across regions. But these hubs and regions do not necessarily dominate new media content as a few major cities and cultural centres did for mass media. New kinds of 'spaces and places' for sociality and culture have been created, as systems like the Internet have been designed specifically to allow any node to connect to any other with network access (Curry, 1998). This architecture was introduced with the telephone system (and to a lesser extent, by the telegraph system before that), and it is both physically and qualitatively different from the 'networks' of broadcasting and print. Indeed, economists and others first recognized that the positive 'network externalities' associated with the telephone system were

different in kind from the economies of scale of broadcasting or print. The larger the network, the more valuable it becomes to every additional new user, as each user gains the advantage of links to more potential respondents and sources of information.

Not only are new media shaped in characteristic ways; they also have distinctive social consequences. Perhaps the most obvious, one that has been commented on since the days of McLuhan, is the *ubiquity* of new media. Though not every individual in a society may use (or indeed have access to) new media technologies, we can say they are ubiquitous because they affect everyone in the societies where they are employed. The reach of ICTs extends far beyond the obvious arenas of entertainment and the workplace. Banking systems, utilities, education, law enforcement, military defence, health care and politics, for example, are all dependent on extensive ICT systems for record-keeping, monitoring and transmitting information – activities that affect anyone who deals with these services or activities.

The sense of ubiquity underlies several major issues that are discussed in the chapters that follow. For example, though ubiquity might be assumed, new technologies and the resources to use them are not distributed evenly or fairly, as evidenced by the flurry of research and news coverage about the ‘digital divide’ in the late 1990s (see Rice and Haythornthwaite, in this volume). By the same token, any system with pervasive reach and influence prompts questions about the control of the system and the power and cultural influence it affords those who are in control; new media systems are no exception. And while the relationship among media messages, public opinion and political participation has been studied extensively, the Internet and other new media technologies have presented new arenas for discourse that challenge the definition and understanding of the public sphere and what constitutes political action (see Luke, in this volume).

Another consequence of new media is the sense of *interactivity* that they convey to users. Interactivity is the main topic of the chapter by Sally McMillan in this volume. Briefly, however, we can say that because switching is a

pivotal part of new media systems, they afford users more selectivity in their choices of information sources and interactions with other people. Communication researchers have known for decades that mass media audiences attend to, perceive and retain information selectively. Yet new media also give users the means to generate, seek and share content selectively, and to interact with other individuals and groups, on a scale that was impractical with traditional mass media. This selectivity accounts for much of the sense of interactivity or social presence associated with new media, as well as their ‘demassified’, or individualized, targeted quality. In turn, the sheer proliferation and diversity of content and sources now available have raised concerns about the quality of the content (for example, its authenticity or reliability), as well as questions about the nature of online experience and interaction (for example, about anonymity or identity of participants in online interaction).

## NEW MEDIA, NEW METHODS?

Because the *Handbook* is organized around major substantive areas of research and scholarship, we have not dedicated a chapter specifically to the methodology of new media research. However, new media studies pose a number of empirical and analytical challenges that merit a brief discussion here.

The chapters in this volume represent a significant collation of past and current empirical research, as well as conceptual frameworks for analysing new media in relation to their social shaping and social consequences. While the field abounds with new and pressing research questions, only recently has attention been paid to the methods by which these are being addressed. Beyond the challenges posed by the multidisciplinary nature of the field, which results in often conflicting conventions underpinning the conduct and evaluation of empirical research, *Handbook* readers may discern two broad methodological issues. First, do new media require new methods to observe and study them? Second, how does empirical research



contribute to the shaping and consequences of the new media being studied?

In response to the first issue, and as is evident from the recent bounty of books and articles addressing the conduct of empirical media research, and new media research in particular, two positions have emerged. The first presumes, at least implicitly, that media research rests on the same, well-established methods as any other area of social science (or humanities). In relation to the new media, therefore, the use of surveys, interviews, case studies, observation, textual analysis and so forth is considered to be 'business as usual'. Those adopting this position would argue that in new media research as elsewhere (perhaps even more so here, given the rush to produce findings before they go out of date), traditional standards of reliability, validity, generalizability and so forth are crucial to the evaluation of good research (e.g. Webster in this volume). This is perhaps the most common perspective, and is clearly laid out in the well-used textbook by Williams et al. (1988). Similarly, Deacon et al. (1999) deal with the Internet solely as a new source of information for media and communication researchers. They offer guidelines to its effective use as a knowledge resource, but say little about it as a subject of empirical research in its own right.

The contrasting position tends to draw primarily on a qualitative or ethnographic tradition (e.g. Hine, 2000), arguing that traditional methods must be changed both conceptually and procedurally. To the extent that new media generally, and virtual environments in particular, challenge key concepts of media research – authority and power, production and consumption, community and identity, and so forth – then research must frame and operationalize its questions (and answers) in different ways (Lyman and Wakeford, 1999). So too, again particularly for virtual environments, many guidelines, practices and evaluative criteria regarding, for example, research ethics, the nature of naturalistic/unobtrusive versus participant observation, or criteria for survey sampling and evaluating response rates, must be reformulated (Mann and Stewart, 2000).

The second broad methodological consideration concerns the social uses of new media

research. It will be apparent in many of the chapters that follow that a major research strategy is to track what are, in effect, real-world experiments, in which new communication infrastructures and changing social phenomena are observed. From these experiments, we can infer early indications of the likely future 'impacts' of these new media and see the social shaping of technology itself, occurring through a path-dependent process of technological change in which contingent histories of adoption matter (see Lievrouw in this volume).

However, because the media being observed are often new or provisional, the research itself may affect the course of its design, implementation or use more than it might for older media, which are more stable and where a critical or neutral distance is more readily sustainable. MacKenzie and Wajcman observe that 'the very process of adoption tends to improve the performance of those technologies that are adopted' (1999: 19); by the same token, researchers must also acknowledge that studies of this adoption feed back into the design process itself. In other words, in so far as new media technologies are shaped not only in the rarefied world of design and innovation but also through their early history of adoption and everyday use, such experiments, and the research that accompanies and assesses them, play a role in the social shaping and social consequences of new media.

Researchers vary in their response to this situation. For many, 'it would be an unforgivable dereliction of the responsibilities of intellectuals if the potentials offered by current developments were not fully explored, and a concerted effort made to shape their direction to bring about at least some of the much talked about utopian visions of communication in the electronic age' (Kress, 1998: 79; see also Biocca, 1993). For others, a critical distance between the researcher and the new media phenomena being researched is crucial to the independence of the research findings.

The very pace of change – both technological and social – poses a challenge to new media research. In other words, the field is in flux, not so much because it is new (indeed, it is at least

20 years old) but because the object of study itself and its social contexts have never been – nor are they likely to become – stable. Researchers working in the area must tolerate ambiguity and be comfortable with the study of moving targets. At the same time, anticipating the future significance of the new media is hazardous in the extreme. Boddy (1985) notes some of the widespread misconceptions, within both public and industry circles, that existed at the time of television's arrival as a mass medium. Many observers failed to anticipate the success of television in dominating culture, information, lifestyles and, more arguably perhaps, public and political life in the second half of the twentieth century. Interestingly, in his highly influential book *Television: Technology and Cultural Form*, Raymond Williams (1974) had similar difficulties with prediction. He conceptualized new technologies primarily in terms of the transformation of television; despite his considerable percipience, he did not anticipate the convergence between broadcasting, telecommunication and, especially, information technology.

We might end this section with a note on terminology. In researching new media, some of the terms from mass media research still apply – production, media institution, design – though they are undoubtedly more complex and less fixed than hitherto. Other terms, however, apply less well. *Text* is one, as new media exploit the intertextual or transtextual (Drotner, 1992), as the meanings conveyed by new media result from an interactive engagement between producers and consumers, and as the texts are mutable, transformed through processes of relocation, transmission, and recombination.

Even more problematically perhaps, there is an uncertainty over how to label people in terms of their relationship with new media. The term *audience*, which was and to some extent still is satisfactory for mass media research, fits poorly within the domain of new media. In a number of important ways, audiences are becoming 'users'. Analytically, audiences are being relocated away from the screen, their activities contextualized into the everyday lifeworld. They are also becoming users because they are grappling with the meaning

of new and unfamiliar media objects (i.e. as technologies, or consumer goods), and this not only in their homes but also in schools and workplaces. Further, they are becoming users because new media and information technologies open up new, more active modes of engagement with media – *playing* computer games, *surfing* the Web, *searching* databases, *responding* to e-mail, *visiting* a chat room, *shopping* online and so on. Etymologically, the term 'audience' only satisfactorily covers the activities of listening and watching (though even this has been expanded to include the activities which contextualize listening and viewing). But the term 'user', despite its problematic histories (e.g. in uses and gratifications research, or its instrumental connotations in technology-driven studies of information retrieval, interface design and 'human factors', which suggest that users of media technologies differ little from users of washing machines or cars), better covers this variety of modes of engagement.

What is significant about people's uses of new media remains, in many ways, what was also significant about audiences for traditional media: that is, the extent to which media engagement is necessary for a common culture, for shared community values or, conversely, the extent to which media engagement undermines, fragments, manipulates or exploits people collectively (as publics, markets, nations and so on). In this sense, the term 'audience' is still appropriate. But grammatically it is awkward, as are 'communicators', 'consumers' or 'users'. One can only conclude, as do the authors of the chapters included here, that no one term can be expected to cover the variety of significant relationships which now exist between people and the media. Perhaps most important is that we use the array of available terms with care, and not lose sight of the observation that has become a consensus among audience researchers (Livingstone, 1999), that the nature of the relationship, rather than the artificial creation of a reified entity (audience, user, consumer), is most central to the analysis of new media and their social consequences. To focus on the relationship also serves to locate this relationship in a social context, for people are,

first and foremost, workers, business people, parents, teachers, friends – thoroughly embedded social roles which precede their status as ‘users’ or ‘audiences’.

## OVERVIEW OF THIS VOLUME

In putting together this book, we have stressed research on socially situated technologies, and on studies that document circumstances where strong cultural concerns or social norms have developed around ICTs. As its subtitle suggests, the social contexts and uses of new media are as important as the technologies themselves. ‘Social shaping’ and ‘consequences’ suggest the evolving, dynamic nature of the systems and their related issues, as well as major approaches to research in the area. On the one hand, there is a concern with agency and action; on the other, a concern with social effects, structure and impacts. While the *Handbook* attempts to cover the field as comprehensively as is practical, no single approach can be said to characterize the whole work, though certain sections may illustrate widely held perspectives.

Overall, one principal purpose of this volume is to lay out the present boundaries of new media research so as to allow a clear view of the current state of the art. We agree that ‘as new fields evolve, there are periodic attempts to take stock of what’s happened so far, how things are going, and what still needs to be done’ (Johansen, 1984). Consequently, the emphasis throughout the chapters that follow is on documenting the most significant social research findings and insights in areas where a substantial amount of work has already been accomplished, rather than on speculations about future technological directions or scenarios. Thus, one ambition of the *Handbook*, prosaically but perhaps most usefully, is that it sets out to draw together in a single place the key resources and trends among the rapidly diversifying variety of new media research. The goal is to make visible and readily accessible work which has already been conducted but which may not be familiar to specialists in particular disciplines. In some domains, the stress

is on consolidating and building on significant contributions already made within the field, while in others it seems more important to incorporate key ideas and approaches from outside, given the interdisciplinary nature of new media research.

A more ambitious aim than that of collating new media research is that of facilitating the identification of key themes and debates which have thus far framed the major contours of new media research, in order to support both critical perspectives on research and the development of future research projects. Hence we have invited chapter authors to identify not only major trends but also problematic claims or assumptions, remaining gaps in the research record, and new domains to be explored. In such future developments it is our hope that researchers from different disciplines and perspectives will not only converge productively on the problematics of new media shaping and consequences, but also take back these perspectives into their home disciplines. For it seems that, at least until very recently, little new-media- or ICT-related research has found its way into the most prestigious, core or mainstream journals in communication research, sociology, social psychology, education, law, economics or political science.

New media research spans not only multiple disciplines but also many countries. Yet, as already noted, it has proved more challenging than anticipated, and perhaps we have been less successful than we had hoped in achieving a multinational coverage of new media research. Research communities tend to be national in orientation, addressing national policy developments, responsive to national funding sources in particular economic and cultural contexts, and networked within distinct linguistic and intellectual traditions. While we are aware of the advantages of learning from comparative research, to some extent, the challenges of developing a comparative overview in the field of new media remain for the future.

Therefore, we offer the *Handbook of New Media* as one in what we hope will be a series of useful surveys and syntheses of new media studies, as more questions are asked, as more

comprehensive and creative answers are found, and as the field and its influence continue to grow.

## NOTES

1 For a longer historical perspective, bearing in mind that all media were once 'new' and gave rise to various hopes and anxieties, readers are encouraged to review the opening chapter of Rice and Associates (1984) as well as several histories of media technologies that have informed the field, including books by Jim Beniger (1986), James Carey (1989), Claude Fischer (1992), Patrice Flichy, (1995 [1991]), Carolyn Marvin (1988) and, more recently, Brian Winston (1996), as well as the edited collection by Chandler and Cortada (2000).

2 This dichotomy is well summarized in the introduction to a collection of key articles from the journal *Media, Culture & Society* (Collins et al., 1986).

## REFERENCES

- Allen, T.J. (1977) *Managing the Flow of Technology: Technology Transfer and the Dissemination of Technological Innovation within the R&D Organization*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Arrow, K. (1979) 'The economics of information', in M.L. Dertouzos and J. Moses (eds), *The Computer Age: a Twenty-Year View*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. pp. 306–17.
- Arrow, K. (1984) *Collected Papers*. Vol. 4: *The Economics of Information*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Baldwin, T.F., McVoy, D.S. and Steinfield, C. (eds) (1996) *Convergence: Integrating Media, Information and Communication*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Barnett, G.A. and Choi, Y. (1995) 'Physical distance and language as determinants of the international telecommunications network', *International Political Science Review*, 16: 249–65.
- Barnett, G.A. and Salisbury, J.G.T. (1996) 'Communication and globalization: a longitudinal analysis of the international telecommunication network', *Journal of World System Research*, 2 (16): 1–17.
- Becker, L.B. and Schoenbach, K. (eds) (1989) *Audience Responses to Media Diversification: Coping with Plenty*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Bell, D. (1973) *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting*. New York: Basic.
- Beniger, J.R. (1986) *The Control Revolution: Technological and Economic Origins of the Information Society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Biocca, F. (1993) 'Communication research in the design of communication interfaces and systems', *Journal of Communication*, 43 (4): 59–68.
- Blumler, J., McLeod, J.M. and Rosengren, K.E. (eds) (1992) *Communication and Culture across Space and Time: Prospects of Comparative Analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Boddy, W. (1985) "'The shining centre of the home": Ontologies of television in the "Golden Age"', in P. Drummond and R. Paterson (eds), *Television in Transition*. London: British Film Institute.
- Boudon, R. (1991) 'What middle-range theories are', *Contemporary Social Psychology*, 20 (4): 519–24.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977 [1972]) *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, trans. R. Nice. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1980) 'The production of belief: contribution to a theory of symbolic goods', *Media, Culture & Society*, 2 (3): 261–93.
- Burgelman, J.-C. (1997) 'Issues and assumptions in communications policy and research in Western Europe: A critical analysis', in J. Corner, P. Schlesinger and R. Silverstone (eds), *International Media Research: a Critical Survey*. London: Routledge.
- Calabrese, A. and Burgelman, J.-C. (eds) (1999) *Communication, Citizenship, and Social Policy: Rethinking the Limits of the Welfare State*. Lanham, MD and Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Carey, J.W. (1989) *Communication as Culture: Essays on Media and Society*. Boston and London: Unwin Hyman.
- Chaffee, S.H. and Chu, G. (1992) 'Communication and cultural change in China', in J. Blumler, J.M. McLeod and K.E. Rosengren (eds), *Communication and Culture across Space and Time: Prospects of Comparative Analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. pp. 209–37.
- Chandler, A.D. Jr and Cortada, J.W. (eds) (2000) *A Nation Transformed by Information: How Information Has Shaped the United States from Colonial Times to the Present*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cherry, E.C. (1978 [1957]) *On Human Communication*, 3rd edn. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cherry, E.C. (1985) *The Age of Access: Information Technology and Social Revolution. The Posthumous Papers of Colin Cherry*, compiled and edited by W. Edmondson. London: Croom Helm.
- Collins, R., Curran, J., Garnham, N., Scannell, P., Schlesinger, P. and Sparks, C. (eds) (1986) *Media, Culture & Society: A Critical Reader*. London: Sage.