

Załącznik nr 2b

Summary of professional accomplishments

1. Name and surname: Jakub Nowak

2. Diplomas, scientific degrees held, with their names, place, and year of award, and the title of doctoral thesis.

MA in political science (2005), thesis on *Cyberpunkowa wizja świata [Cyberpunk as a vision of the world]*, written at Faculty of Political Science of Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin under the supervision of prof. dr. hab. Włodzimierz Mich.

PhD in the humanities in the field of political science by the decision of Board of Faculty of Political Science MCSU June 26th 2009; thesis title: *Aktywność obywateli online. Teorie a praktyka [Citizen engagement online. Theories and practice]*, scientific supervisor: prof. dr hab. Włodzimierz Mich.

3. Information on employment in academic institutions to date:

Since October 1st 2009 – associate professor (adjunct) in Journalism Department at Faculty of Political Science of Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin.

2007-2014 – academic teaching obligations for University College of Enterprise and Administration in Lublin based on commission contracts.

4. Publication indicated as the „achievement” as described in Article 16 par. 2 of the Law on Academic Degrees and Title and Degrees and Title in the Arts (Dz. U. No. 65, item. 595 as amended)

a) title of scientific achievement, author, title of the publication, year, publisher:

monograph *Polityki sieciowej popkultury [Politics of popular culture online]*, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, Lublin 2017, pp. 462, ISBN: 978-83-227-9001-4.

c) Overview of the scientific objective of the achievement, its results, and their potential application

Introductory remarks: the path leading to the monograph

My research interests on new media perceived as tool and environment of civic and pop-cultural engagement have been rooted in my PhD thesis' preparation. Thesis' subject (*Citizen engagement online. Theories and practice*) concerned transformations of citizen social practices caused – among other factors – by developing new media. Further years of my academic career are natural continuation of research in the field: most of the articles published since 2009 – and the monograph itself, presented to the Central Commission on Degrees and Titles as my scientific achievement in the light of the Law on Academic Degrees and Title and Degrees and Title in the Arts – can be perceived as further steps of the research endeavor started during my PhD studies at Faculty of Political Science of Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin. My research after obtaining the PhD has mainly concerned transformations of social practices of participation in popular culture and civic activities when both of them are mediated by new media. In particular, my research activities have gone in several closely connected (sometimes intersecting) thematic directions:

The first two concern changes in repertoires of people's actions when they perform citizen and pop-cultural practices. Therefore, the first general thematic field of my studies comprise questions on the course, directions, and effects of changes in repertoires of citizen actions online. New media give new opportunities to people (individuals, groups) performing informational or organizational actions: producing, re-creating, distributing, and discussing online content is quite easy and cheap nowadays. Along with the development of new media, the catalogue of activists' direct action broadens as well. Yet, normative evaluations of these transformations are ambiguous – the internet has sometimes been dysfunctional for political activism. These topics were covered in my papers on new social movements online, hacktivism, or the internet as the sphere of civic debates.

The second direction of my research has focused at patterns of people's participation in popular culture when it is digitally mediated. New media not only facilitate new ways of producing, distributing and receiving culture industry products, but also they may shape new social practices of members of pop-cultural communities, like unauthorized usage (distribution, reception, reproduction) of popular culture content online; new pop-cultural media genres distinctive for new media; new aesthetics and axiologies connected to them. Within this field, my research has focused on topics like new internet genres like internet memes or machinima, social practices connected to them; and, not least, popular culture communities of shared meanings. These analyses are closely related to my research on civic engagement online – while perceiving the sphere of popular culture as symbolic space in which people redefine their collective identities and negotiate dominant ideologies, I interpret changes in pop-cultural activities as *also* political. These connections are especially evident in analyses of citizen activities in which popular culture online is the form of the action or the subject of such action in question. This very kind of social practices, combining ludic and

political motivations, is the subject of my scientific works on the anti-ACTA protests and other citizen practices using pop-cultural forms (like internet memes) and content.

The third direction of my research concerns new media themselves. There have been intensive transformations on media markets in the last two decades, including radical changes of new media. Contemporary internet mediatizes social practices in the unprecedented scope and this process makes explanations of who, how, and with what effects sets the limits of these practices by structural regulations of new media so important. This is why – by the research on media content flows or regulations of people's online actions – I was interested in the *operations* of new media, the latter understood not only as particular media technologies but also particular agents (providing people with their own 'internets' or tools for civic/pop-cultural activities) having their goals, interests or legal contexts of operation. These questions are related to the complex issue of users' agency – a crucial one for studies on both activism and popular culture.

These dilemmas have led me to the fourth, most theoretical field of my research: how to conceptualize new media? How to grasp this complex entity analytically? And how to ground users' activities within it? From the perspective of media studies' history, the last decades of XX century are times when approaches alternative to transmission models-based were developed. Media studies reached for concepts originated within the field of culture studies (the British so called Birmingham school, combining semiotic approaches and reception studies & political economy of media); science and technology studies (STS) underlining social constructions of media technologies (media technologies perceived as discourses); or sociology-based concepts of media as practices. I used these approaches to various extent in my after-PhD research. I started by using John Fiske's theory of popular culture (2010, first published in 1989)¹ and used his 'cultural populism' as theoretical foundation of my research on popular culture. Later, I reached for one of his predecessors, that is – hardly present in the Polish studies in the field – works of Stuart Hall, the leader and the key member of the Birmingham school. Hall's publications helped me organize my theoretic considerations on culture or political aspects of people's online activities. At the same time, they offered valuable tools for describing emergent online media genres. I still needed theoretical framework to conceptualize new media that would include and highlight their radically complex and irreducible characteristics. Eventually, I found such framework in the works of Michel Foucault. Following his suggestions in Foucault's studies of interrelations among discourse and power has led me to formulate – at the stage of working on my monograph – broad systemic (in terms of scale, not of method) diagnosis of contemporary new media.

Finally, another important theme of my research endeavor was research methodology. I based my empirical analyses of online (citizen, pop-cultural) practices on methods of social semiotics adapted to the peculiar nature of my own research subject.

All these issues, elaborated in my papers published since 2009, were proceeded and developed in the monograph *Politics of popular culture online*, presented to Central Commission on Degrees and Titles as my scientific achievement as described in Article 16 par. 2 of the Law on Academic Degrees and Title and Degrees and Title in the Arts (Dz. U. 2016 r. poz. 882 ze zm. w Dz. U. z 2016 r. poz. 1311).

¹ Full bibliographic descriptions of the publications used in this paper can be found in the monograph presented as my scientific achievement.

Research goal of the monograph

The main goal of the presented monograph is to describe and to explain why people's participation in popular culture online is increasingly often political and what are the effects of the fact it is increasingly political. I analyze the process of blurring distinctions between spheres of people's pop-cultural and political practices online, as well as the process' contexts and effects. The research goal presented as above begs for broad perspective which makes the presented book also focusing on transformations of popular culture caused by its digital mediatization: what are the changes in participation in popular culture, its effects and contexts in the times when digital media have become a key tool for this participation and the internet has become one of its key spaces?

In particular, I was interested in political aspects of the process, that is, those pop-cultural practices online that are performed by agents entangled in particular political relations. Of course: e-voting or – especially popular nowadays (in academic, marketing, journalistic discourses) – professional political communication online during elections are crucial phenomena for contemporary political systems. In my monograph, however, I support the argument that there is another kind of social practices that have a growing importance for democratic politics, that is social practices combining spheres of citizen engagement and popular culture. This is why the monograph focuses on practices of participation in popular culture online that are also political – the processes in which 1) online popular culture has become a 'language' by which citizens 'speak' when performing their activities; or 2) when popular culture online is the subject of citizen engagement², that is, a resource upon which particular agents compete/fight.

Therefore, the analysis should comprise a precise description of the internet as environment of people's social practices. The internet mediatizes contemporary politics and popular culture in complex technological, social, economic, discursive processes. The market dimension of digital mediatization has become increasingly important along with commercialization of the Web itself; new media are not only mere technology, but also a system of market agents of growing position and particular economic goals. How these goals are accomplished affects patterns of participation in popular culture or politics – and this is one of the central themes of my book. New media also consist of catalogues of particular practices performed by particular people in particular contexts, and, not last, collective (again: of particular groups in particular moments in history) imaginations of *what, for whom, and having what characteristics* new media are. After combining all these directions of my research I can reformulate my research goal as: reconstruction of the political status of this complex and irreducible entity of new media as tools of process of articulation, the latter understood as complex set of practices by which people reproduce their individual and group identities.

Main categories

² In the monograph (and my other academic publications) 'citizen engagement' is understood as political actions of non-institutional individuals and groups. This is a narrow understanding of the term, excluding directly non-political activities like those performed within groups of shared pop-cultural interests or neighbor communities (the latter, broad meaning of citizen engagement is used by i.a. Robert Putnam in his seminal work on social capital, 2009, first published in 2000).

The monograph concerns *Politics of online popular culture* and the categories used in the title refer to the triad of politics-media-culture setting the range of my scientific endeavor. Communication can be perceived as their lowest common denominator. I define it broadly, as process of settling meaning. This way of understanding the term underlines the communal aspect of the process and uses the category of ‘meaning’ which refers to the academic semiotic tradition.

Being aware of a huge number of definitions of culture, I understand it – in the context of the book – as the system of meanings created and shared by people in particular moment in history, as well as all practices performed by these people. In a way, culture is not only a sum but also a *synergy* of communication. Culture, when understood this way, consists of, among other things, popular culture and politics. Political activities are performed in culture and by culture – by uses of its symbolic resources.

I defined *popular culture* after John Fiske (2010: 23) as the process of producing and sharing meanings and pleasures in particular social system. In the book I focus especially at popular culture online and the process of its digital mediatization, that is, how people use new media as tools and spaces of participation in pop-culture. Popular culture online – when perceived as such – comprises increasingly complex communities, actions related to them, and texts – discursive structures of potential meanings – published, distributed, commented online. Because of this differentiation I write not only about ‘one’ popular culture in the book understood as the sum of all practices of this kind, but I use also the term in the plural form.

Politics, then, is understood as the sphere defined by the status of agents involved in the process – and it is understood in two ways. The first one could be described as rooted in political science: it captures politics as the sphere of human action – activities performed by agents having contradictory interests and the effects of these (Tansey 1997; Dahl & Stinebrickner 2007; Mouffe 2008). This understanding of politics makes citizen protest or public debate *political*. The second way of understanding politics is broader and related to the key theoretical tradition in my book, that is British cultural studies. As academic approach, they impose inherently political character on processes of communication, because they highlight the importance of articulation while perceiving common cultural practices as the most important sphere of propagating/questioning dominant ideologies. In this perspective, popular culture is inevitably political because it comprises ‘micropolitics’ (Fiske 2010: 59) – various ‘politics of everyday life’: processes of reconstruction of meanings by which relations of power are reproduced or negotiated in people’s everyday lives.

The last of the categories to define is *new media*. Digital mediatization, or as some say: media convergence, blurs the distinction on old and new media. The new media logic has become an algorithm affecting contemporary: television, radio, press, cinema, or photography. Computer and internet mediatize all other media, changing their interfaces and social patterns of usage. In some sense, there is no other media than new media, and this process has become one of the key (and most difficult) challenges for media scholars nowadays.

Digital mediatization is a set of cultural, economic, political phenomena connected to people’s everyday life media practices that are affected by market and political agents. This way of thinking about new media means they are not only tool but also space of participation in politics and popular culture – space understood in the anthropological way, that is, as a particular context set by social practices (Moore 1986: 116). My book comprises analyses of

particular practices summing up to this online participation, as well as their structural (operating algorithms, changing status of media content after development of new – media – tools), economic (strategies of agents selling these new tools), normative (legal ones or terms of conditions-related) conditions – all affecting a complex shape of the contemporary internet.

New media are *also* cultural construct shared by people, that is continuously reconstructed by work of various discourses – hegemonic ones related to market agents providing people with their own ‘internets’ or legislators regulating their functioning; but also bottom-up ones that are constructed by people’s collective (pop)cultural activities. To explain the main cultural characteristics of contemporary new media, I recall also cultural phenomena of the last decades of XX century – I seek for new media logic not only in how new media has developed but also in how media have transformed in general. Thus, technology can be perceived as a resource used by particular agents in particular historic contexts – their status (creators, disposers, vendors of digital technology) is crucial for the argument in the book. I have used the term of ‘culture industry’ to describe some of them, understanding it quite traditionally (Adorno, Horkheimer 1994: 138-188; first published in 1947) as market agents that produce and sell standardized cultural goods (music, movies, television, games). Culture industry nowadays has been split into two (which is one of the key arguments in the book): traditional culture industry and the new, ‘digital’ one. The latter comprises digital intermediaries like Google or Facebook, having new, often opposing to traditional culture industry, business models.

Research questions

Considering arguments of qualitative analysis scholars (Krippendorff 2013; Emmel 2013) made me formulating open research questions instead of hypotheses. It is more about emphasizing particular methodological stances than choosing completely different strategy; the set of research questions can be perceived as analogical to the set of hypotheses – as suggested by Stefan Nowak (2012: 35, first published in 1985) in his seminal work on methodology of sociology. Open research questions seem more appropriate in the scientific endeavor like mine – using hypotheses means one has to verify them which can be a limitation when conducting qualitative research focusing on explanation and interpretation (Emmel 2013: 81; Nowak 2012: 34–36)

The first main research question (Q1) is: what is cultural and political status of people’s participation in popular culture online when the process is mediated by the new culture industry, that is, digital intermediaries?

The second main research question (Q2) is: what is political status of citizen engagement online, when it is performed by market services offered by digital intermediaries? In other words: what is the status of agency of citizens performing activities online?

I have formulated other research questions that are related to the main two:

Q3: What are discursive strategies realized by new culture industry?

Q4: What are the effects of naturalization of algorithms regulating how new media work?

Q5: What is ideology of pop-cultural online media genres? What relatively coherent system of meanings is connoted by rules concerning content, form, and uses of modalities like meme, remix, machinima, or trailer online?

I have been using several examples³ of particular practices online referring them in my analysis to ‘extratextual phenomena, about meanings, consequences, or particular uses’ (Krippendorff 2013: 37). I focus my analysis especially at protests against ACTA in 2012 – the monograph consists analysis of the protest’s practices but also their tools, contexts and theoretical interpretations. The anti-ACTA movement, then, is the subject of the last detailed research question:

Q6: What is the status of anti-ACTA protests in 2012 as bottom-up collective action comprising pop-cultural and political activities?

Theoretical and methodological background

Main, irreducibly connected, areas of my analysis are: researching new media as culture construct, political status of new media as space for people’s action, pop-cultural and citizen practices online. This broad approach begs using various theoretical traditions and methodological tools which made *Politics of popular culture online* a truly interdisciplinary work. The monograph is situated in the field of media studies and uses their methodological instruments. However, it also uses – to some extent – theoretical tradition of political science and cultural studies. This interdisciplinarity comes also from the specifics of my research subject: social practices analyzed in the book are often both citizen and pop-cultural activity – which makes them two kinds of practices identical ontologically and different epistemologically.

The main theoretical perspective in the book is set by the critical theory. In particular, I have used the British cultural studies approach – and, within in, media studies conducted from the beginning of the 70. in Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at Birmingham University led by Stuart Hall. Hall’s theoretical achievements for contemporary media studies is hard to overestimate: his works on relations among culture and media underlined complex relations between media audiences’ practices and processes of ideological reproduction or redefinitions of collective identities. Hall’s models of encoding/decoding or of circuit of culture have become foundations of contemporary audience studies and semiotic theories of media genres. His thought has been for me, firstly, a good starting point for questions on status of new media as spaces of articulation. Secondly, I used his works on reproduction and negotiation ideologies in people’s everyday activities using them in my interpretations of social practices online. I also integrated Hall’s seminal model of television program as meaningful discourse (Hall 1987: 61; first published in 1973/1980) into my analyses of new online media genres. Stuart Hall’s theoretical proposals turned out to be a fruitful starting point when asking about cultural, political, technologic, economic conditions shaping new media as environments of human action.

³ I explain in more detail the process of choosing analyzed cases and how they are combined with my argument in chapter 3 of the monograph: *Research methods*.

‘Semiotics of everyday life’ (Wróblewski 2012: 34) conducted by Hall and his colleagues from CCCS was characterized by the recognition of the high role of mass media in life cycles of cultural communities while underlining agency of members of the latter. This notion of culture has quickly spurred research on popular culture in the perspective of the so called ‘cultural populism’, underlining productive consumption of culture industry products and ‘semiotic power’ of culture industry consumers being *actual* creators of popular culture. John Fiske (2010, first published in 1989) perceives popular culture this way: I used his theoretical work to analyze social practices of using new media. Whereas Hall’s models are conducive to accurate grasping media, cultural, political processes in macro-scale, Fiske’s theory of popular culture enriches the analysis when it focuses at particular social practices, texts and their readings/uses. Fiske underlines the meaning of ‘semiotic power’ of media audiences/users and perceives media as providing resources used by people in their relatively free production of meanings and identities during consumption of cultural commodities.

These quite optimistic views are balanced by diagnoses by Michel Foucault whose thought on interconnections between discourse, power, and technology helps to understand and describe new media (Foucault offers very useful dictionary) and the accompanied cultural change. One of the key categories in his works – and also one of the key category in my monograph – is *discourse* that can be described as ordered way of speaking about particular phenomena and as inherently tied to power and knowledge. Foucault writes in 1970 essay of *The Order of discourse* that power is discursive in its nature and the key tool for its domination is peculiarly understood epistemology: by the discursive ‘regime of truth’ (by that what is perceived as true) power is institutionally ‘used in society, [...] its evaluated, distributed, divided, and granted’ (Foucault 2002: 13). It means that discourse possesses a specific kind of power – to discipline agents for particular way of thinking or acting. Foucault also claims there is a constant and complex relation among various discourses: some of them dominate in particular moments of history – especially those *most true*, that create social imagination in the most convincing way. This discursive power is yielded by and within complex formations labelled as institutional apparatuses. The latter consist of: discourses, institutions, architecture forms, regulations, laws, administrative resources, scientific arguments, philosophical claims, or, not least, complex interconnections among all these parts (Foucault 1980: 140). I used this notion of institutional apparatus to conceptualize new media in my book – it has let me grasp the subject in possibly coherent yet still broad enough way. This perspective, also, underlined the role of discourses of new media as factors co-shaping new media’s cultural definitions and uses.

The monograph consists of not only theoretical arguments but also analyses of uses of new media as tool/space of particular people’s actions. The internet is very peculiar medium of activities of this kind: it enables and visualizes participation in popular culture or civic engagement by mediating products of ‘tactical – pop-cultural – consumption’ like remixes, memes, or online conversation about these. The basic research background used in my study is social semiotics. It is a method of analyzing semiotic systems at their work that focuses at focusing at meaning-making practices and their cultural, political, economic contexts. Social semiotics fits well theoretical background of the book as it is also a critical approach cohesive to the way Hall or Fiske understood communication and culture as inherently tied to relations of power (Hodge & Kress 1988; van Leeuwen 2005; Kress & van Leeuwen 2006). Therefore, I could use the approach to analyze particular online content (qualitative content analysis following Klaus Krippendorff guidelines, 2013), and also to trace back – when possible –

who, where and why used this content. Thus, I analyzed particular online content (texts, graphics, audiovisuals) as multimodal content embedded in their own contexts by two levels – denotation, connotation – of meaning.

The scope of research

Perceiving new media as institutional apparatus helped me grasp their complex nature – they are heterogenic and in permanent flux while comprising distinguishable parts and rules of operation. These parts are not only technologies but also: various inter-related discourses; national and international institutions; market agents; architecture forms like protocols, platform and online services designs, content management systems; social practices; regulations (legal, moderation policies, netiquettes); scientific arguments. Thus, new media are – also – a culture construct shared and constantly re-created by activities of related agents: technology providers, legislators, users – individuals and groups. The central part of institutional apparatuses are discourses: they yield a peculiar kind of power disciplining agents (users) not only to particular action but also to particular way of thinking (like complicated cultural status of practices labeled as piracy; the status of pornography online as the symbol of free ‘everyday’ using of digital media). By all these, new media are being reconstructed as culturally shared imaginary.

The monograph is an attempt to reconstruct this discursive image. To support my argument I recalled analyses of other scholars. I used theoretical considerations capturing specific nature of digital mediality – Alexander Galloway’s (2006; 2008a; 2008b; 2012) and Wendy Chun’s (2004) papers on cultural and political status of software; Lev Manovich’s (2003; 2006; 2013) and Peter Lunenfeld’s (2011) theories of digital media. I also recalled: Jan Pleszczyński’s relational theory of communication (2013); Lisa Gitelman’s (2006) concept of media as culture protocols; Nick Couldry’s (2005; 201; 2012) theory of media as practices; as well as seminal interpretations of late XX century culture by Fredric Jameson (2011a; 2011b) and Jean Baudrillard (2005; 2006; 2007). My argument on digital mediatization of culture practices is based on papers by Mirosław Filiciak (2008; 2013); works of Tarleton Gillespie (2010; 2012; 2014) and Jean Burgess & Joshua Green’s (2011) on digital intermediaries; and, not last, media convergence theory by Henry Jenkins (2006; 2007; 2008; 2011) – however, I was quite skeptical when recalling the latter. The analysis of digital media genres is based on Jason Mittell’s studies of media genres (2004); internet memes’ analyses by Limor Shifman (2011; 2014) and Ryan Milner (2013a; 2013b). Milner’s work is also used in the part of the book comprising analysis of contemporary digital activism. I wrote the latter also referring to Gabriella Coleman’s paper on online countercultures (2011; 2013; 2014); concept of connective action by Lance Bennett and Alexandra Segerberg (2012) and papers written by Polish sociologists from European Centre for Solidarity on the anti-ACTA movement (Jurczyszyn 2014; Kołtan 2014; Kuczyński 2014; Rakusa-Suszczewski 2014).

Beside all of these, the book is based on my own analyses. It consists of new, previously not published research and references to outcomes of my other analyses on: new digital media

genres like memes [2; 3]⁴ or machinima [24]; their political uses in citizen protests [1; 18; 20; 22]; hacktivist practices [26]; or other phenomena of popular culture online [27].

The monograph is divided into four parts. The first is *Theoretical foundations*, comprising theoretical background of the book, explanation of the key categories, remarks on research methods used. The two following parts are organized by the metaphor of ‘strategies’ and ‘practices’ by French culture studies’ scholar Michel de Certeau (2008, first published in 1980) as basic ways of action undertaken by two groups of agents – culture industry and ‘people’ – participating together in popular culture. The strategies are realized by institutions and structures of power labeled by de Certeau as ‘producers’. Tactics are ‘common’, everyday activities performed by individuals using products that are effects of strategies.

The second part of the monograph – *New media (strategies)* – focuses at new media understood as complex technological and cultural construct created by various intersecting discourses. I reconstruct culture history of new media and describe their key characteristics. Later, by recalling a dialectic notion of culture industry, I analyze new media as services offered by digital intermediaries. I reconstruct their hegemonic discourse to show how seemingly neutral algorithms (a ‘technology of everyday life’) naturalize the political-economic position of the new digital culture industry. This part of the book consists of also the argument on why I dub new media *machine of visibility*. In other words, the second part of the monograph reconstructs discursive, normative and structural conditions of people’s social practices online.

The third part of the book focuses at *Popular cultures (tactics)*. It starts with the analysis of ideology of popular culture online by showing how it relates to particular social practices online – I based the argument on the assumption that there is a coherent system of meanings tied to forms and content of online media genres as well as to social practices of their reception, (re)production, (re)distribution. Then, I analyze axiology of popular culture online and discursive characteristics of the internet that are related to it (including its ludic and occasionally subversive characteristics). In this part, I also analyze new media as spaces of cultural articulation. I provide the argument with several examples of bottom up online activities, including anti-ACTA protests. By questions on status of pop-cultural and citizen engagement online, I also analyze the issue of participants’ agency in the context of rising commodification and structural limitation of contemporary internet.

The fourth and last part of the book comprises broad *Summaries and interpretations* of previous arguments by discussions on the concepts of: new media as institutional apparatus in which various hegemonies compete with each other; increasingly problematic issue of *agency* as the term explaining how people participate in popular culture; the status of contemporary new media as sphere of political action.

Research outcomes

The analytical reconstruction of my research subject composes the image of new media as the outcome of complex, multidirectional, and occasionally antagonistic (on levels of discourses,

⁴ Numbers in the brackets refer to publications listed in the List of my publication presented to the Central Commission.

politics, actions) relations. These are processes encapsulating actions by institutional (national and international agents shaping politics and legal frameworks) or market (various media companies) agents, as well as people's activities performing roles of technology users, co-creators and participants in popular culture, consumers, citizens. In new media institutional apparatus we can observe competing discursive formations, including hegemonies and counterhegemonies – processes of creating and supporting dominant – yet also unstable – ideologies, meanings and culture forms, working together for the inclusion individuals into always unstable consensus.

I argue that one of the most important processes determining the shape of contemporary institutional apparatus of new media is the division of culture industry. The latter undergoes the process of digital mediatization dominated by digital intermediaries like Google or Facebook having their business model based on profits of mediating online copyrighted content belonging to other company. This relatively small group of agents (I dub it *new culture industry*) has a fundamental meaning for the shape of contemporary internet. Digital intermediaries not only affect the most important normative frameworks (issues of ownership or 'piracy') of new media characteristics, but also affect the process of setting the limits – real and discursively postulated – of participation in popular culture and political engagement. Moreover, their market-based activities are culturally and politically important *also* because they are enclosed in the process of naturalization as 'impartial or 'natural' characteristics of new media. In other words, the key part of the hegemonic discourse of new media is the discursive politics of new culture industry aimed at blurring inherently economic status of digital technology nowadays.

There are two kinds of ideological strategies within this policy – and this diagnosis is the answer to the third (Q3) research question. I call the first one *reduction to technology* – it is based on the myth of reducing mediation (digital intermediaries claim: 'we cannot affect published/distributed/displayed content') and is accomplished by underlining only technical – 'neutral' – nature of the services they offer ('we offer just technological tools being used by people in various ways') in order to reduce liability for action undertaken within them by other agents. The second strategy is *moral legitimization* and it shapes images of digital technology as useful, egalitarian, conducive to culture or democracy. The capitalistic discourse of Web 2.0 is based on these claims – especially when it depicts the consumer of digital services as the creator of contemporary internet and blurs the limits between producers, distributors, consumers of culture products.

Another part of institutional apparatus of new media – and equally important as discursive strategies of digital intermediaries – is software. It is technology and also a resource having complex – political, economic, cultural – status. This technology is entangled into complicated nature of agency of all subjects performing online practices – the reconstruction of this status is the answer to the fourth (Q4) research question. Processes of digital mediatization make new media (then, also software) culturally ubiquitous. This is a peculiar kind of ubiquity: the higher the ubiquity is, the more invisible software becomes when being 'ordinary' as technology of people's everyday lives. It is not only 'embedded' in discourses of new media as its subject but also it is another discourse of this kind – the one that is quite difficult to be seen as it is enclosed by the aforementioned processes of naturalization. Therefore, we can perceive software as functional analogy to ideology: it offers choices by

which it sets limits of that what can and cannot be seen, what can and cannot be imagined (as possible online). And usually – like ideologies – it performs it in a discreet way.

This is why I decided to write about software as *medium of agency*. This mediation is peculiar – it is reversed, from the user to the depositary of the code. Usually, the latter is any market agent that provides user with particular service. The process is fundamental for contemporary politics and culture as software operates by interventions in all aspects of people's activities online. It is search engines and systems of horizontal content distribution that decide about content's visibility in online environments. Therefore, these search engines and systems are the first condition for political or cultural activities online. Computer with the internet connection is *machine of visibility*. In the age of total digital mediatization, the ability to decide about visibility and invisibility of online content has become a high-stake resource: enclosed instructions decide about visibility of objects online shaped by market agents – especially powerful digital intermediaries.

The cultural and political role of software as technology of everyday life is not an effect of its invisibility and complex nature, but is also connected to market processes. Software has become infrastructure (tool) of agency and also its medium. Software is a resource for discursive power because culture definitions it produces by selecting information or drawing maps of possible social practices online (for example by closed catalogues of actions within social media) are explained by seemingly not-changeable technical issues. This is also the way by which new media are naturalized by a reduction to technology: the limits of using computers or the internet seem to be set by physics and mathematics and not by economy or politics.

The hegemony of contemporary new media consists of fluid relations redefined also by everyday practices of internet users. This is how counterhegemonic discourses are shaped – the ones connected to online pop-cultures: activities of producing and sharing negotiated meanings and pleasures by particular groups of people symbolically using products of culture industry. New media are main tools and spaces for popular culture nowadays. These processes are interesting also because of their paradoxical nature: digital mediatization of popular culture, on one hand, broadens catalogue of how people can participate in popular culture by introducing new relatively easy unauthorized 'uses' of culture industry products, their easy modification, convenient tools for their distribution and discussion among them. On the other hand, the totality of digital mediatization of culture means the latter is colonized by the market as increasing number of culture processes is to some extent mediated by digital intermediaries. Which means, then, along with the process of digital mediatization, it is capitalism that co-sets – stronger and more precisely than at mass media era – the limits of participation in popular culture.

When analyzing popular culture online, I use the category of *media genre* that can be defined as particular socially recognizable acts of communication, notions about audiences (users), and particular social practices. There is a particular ideology inscribed into each genre, that is, relatively coherent set of norms and worldviews discursively tied to practices of reception of particular media content. These assumptions have let to formulate the argument that digital mediatization of popular culture leads to changes in pop-culture axiology. Reconstruction of ideology of pop-cultural online media genres is the answer to research question Q5. I start it by analyzing new digital cultural forms like internet memes, fake trailers, and machinima.

These new ‘digital’ media genres sum up into a coherent semiotic proposal which can be described by Hall’s ‘meaningful discourse’. Its main parts are: culture dispersion; seemingly unlimited semiosis – de- and recontextualization; openness of online content (symbolic but also literally understood as ability to being reproduced); authorship that is anonymous and collective; and, not last, hybrid model of production and distribution combining bottom-up activities and actions by culture industry agents (search engines, social media). The last part of this depiction of ideology of online popular culture is very peculiar kind of humor, often tied to normative transgression. It is so called logic of *lulz*, vulgar and aggressive, connected to provocative and cynical culture of trolling aimed at esthetical and ethical norms of cultural mainstream.

These features of online popular culture gain special importance in the context of blurring distinctions between pop-cultural and citizen engagement. Citizen engagement online increasingly often is ludic and motivated not only by social capital but also by pop-cultural pleasures. The meaning of online popular cultures rises as well – they are not only a ‘language’ of citizen activities online but also the subject of such activities when internet regulations are at stake. By these processes popular culture online has become ‘language’ and symbolic space of articulation – a complex set of practices by which people reproduce their individual and collective identities.

All of these are characteristics of anti-ACTA (Anti-Counterfeit Trade Agreement) protests in 2012 (their analysis is the answer to sixth – Q6 – research question). New media were used as tool for effective citizen mobilization against the international treaty aimed at expanding global copyright regime and introducing new state tools of users’ privacy violation. Polish anti-ACTA protests were also a collective act with a broader symbolical scope. The protesters, by sharing online countless number of content about the agreement and its contexts, performed collective discursive act of self-description (of ‘internet user’) and appropriated ‘their’ internet as the commons. New media have been defined as the alternative to media mainstream at the centre of users’ media social practices. The anti-ACTA movement has become culture movement focusing at protecting broadly understood freedom (including the right to use the internet), practices of piracy; online pornography; access to online pop-culture and knowledge repositories. The internet has been defined as the precondition for freedom and also as its tool.

This definition of the internet was depicted by symbols taken mostly from online popular culture: internet memes, audiovisual remixes, pop-cultural heroes, including online ones – like masked figure of Anonymous. These symbols worked as emanations of the ideology of online popular culture – in particular: bottom-up, intertextual, naughty aspects of online social practices – underlining the meaning of seemingly facetious social practices. The protesters used the internet as a repository of global content (popular culture online) being utilized in very local ways: the mask of Anonymous was remixed with the symbol of Polish Underground State from WWII in the anti-ACTA memes. From this perspective the Polish protests were loud and collective culture action in order to discursively re-appropriate new media as the commons being an integral part of the cultural experience (and identity) of young Poles nowadays.

The answers to research questions Q3-Q6 are parts of the answers to two main research questions of the monograph, that is, the one (Q1) on the status of people’s participation in

popular culture online, and (Q2) one about the status of agency of citizen performing activities online within market services offered by digital intermediaries. It means that when formulating the answers to Q1 and Q2 I refer to most of topics covered in the book, including: new media discourses, political-economic dialectic between old and new culture industry, new online media genres, practices tied to them, changes in patterns of using copyrighted material, dynamics and rules of operation of online counter-cultures, various citizen activities online.

I paid most attention to the anti-ACTA protests – also because they highlight the issue of protesters agency. It comes from the peculiar nature of new media as tools and spaces of anti-ACTA actions: protest activities – performed online and offline – were in line with digital intermediaries goals. It is important as the latter could quite freely regulate the visibility of content online. We do not know if Google or Facebook did that – and this lack of knowledge says a lot about their strong position within institutional apparatus of new media. However, political and cultural agency of the protesters is beyond discussion. The protest belonged to protesters *themselves*, although it was conducive also to digital culture industry interests and was performed by tools given by this digital culture industry. The anti-ACTA discourse has been a symbolic performance redefining cultural status of new media. The latter were both: subject and medium of the action and were used as its tool and environment while affecting the process discursively: online pop-culture provided the protesters with languages, references, aesthetics and contexts for the undertaken action. The process of digital mediatization of popular culture, thus, supports its significance in the processes of ideological reproduction. Therefore, participation in popular culture is inherently political as popular culture online is a common language (practices, contexts, ideologies, media genres) by which agents perform process of articulation, that is, reconstruct their collective identities.

Summing up, new media – being highly heterogenous entities – as institutional apparatus affect structural transformations of social systems within they operate. Hegemonies of traditional and new culture industry compete within them – and both of them relate to counterhegemonies of popular cultures online, sometimes having short-term alliances (like during anti-ACTA protests). New culture industry dominates nowadays as it sets framework for citizen or culture practices online; digital intermediaries shape the very architecture of the internet by decisions on technological and formal boundaries of these practices. It may be the shortest answer to two main research questions (Q1 and Q2): the process of digital mediatization of various spheres of culture or social reality, controlled by the new culture industry, makes users' agency very ambiguous and entangled in an odd dialectics between rising possibilities and rising limitations. The more of the former, the more of the latter.

In other words, collective production of cultural definitions – when performed online – is *still* autonomous. Yet, as a process, it is radically different than even two decades ago because it takes place in very peculiar environment. This environment is constructed by software that is technology of everyday life practically working beside any control from its users. The issue of lacking transparency of online code as technology of everyday life and its market conditions define problem of limits of public sphere or civic engagement nowadays. Moderation policies, interpretations of copyright, catalogues of possible (technically, legally, ethically) social practices imposed upon users decide about visibility and invisibility of all kinds of online content. Thus, they decide also about visibility and invisibility of actions performed online, as contemporary new media are also spaces of particular – cultural, citizen – practices.

Some of political events of the last dozen of months – I am writing these words in April 2018 – suggest additional commentary about the research outcomes of the book. The last presidential campaign in US and that what happened after – including unresolved participation of bots in online election public debate, how non-US agents could affect the campaign and the election itself, and, not last, professionalization of the campaign by activities of Cambridge Analytica – seem to confirm diagnoses formulated in the monograph. The American campaign highlighted huge meaning of new media for shaping US politics (soon probably for politics *anywhere*), revealing the scale of its mediatization according to the cultural logic of new media as reconstructed in my book. This is a deep transformation of civic engagement, not only their forms but also their structural and axiological conditions.

In this perspective, both anti-ACTA protests and 2016 American election campaign have shown that during online debates increasingly often it is visibility of the content – not positive relation to facts – what counts most. They have also shown that aesthetics and axiology of online popular culture, including its naughtiness (transgression of cultural norms) and cynicism of the culture of trolling may be socially constitutive for particular communities (anti-ACTA protesters, Trump's supporters gathered within the alt-right movement) but also exclusive and weakening dialogue or understanding. Not last, both phenomena have revealed that – being an inherent part of the Web 2.0 discourse – the true identity of agents online and transparency of their goals and actions are mere illusions – not only the identity (grassroots or partisan? national or external?) of particular agents is hidden, but also their ontological status (is he/she a true supporter, a hired troll, or maybe...bot?)

In the broader perspective, all citizen or political campaigns online have shown also the problem of the unclear status of digital intermediaries which real position is absolutely crucial for *all* online activities and still unregulated. From the legal point of view these agents still operate as mere technology providers transferring onto users liability for actions performed within services offered by them while – as I argument in the monograph – actively shaping visibility of the content (online materials, actions, or agents themselves – people, organizations, bots) online. The limits of possible forms of participation in public debate are moved in directions set by the cultural logic of new media. The latter have changed the rules of the political game: public debate is *debate* no more and it is *public* no more, while engaging increasing number of not transparent status and equally non transparent ways of action. In the era of total online mediatization discourses of new media and other parts of their institutional apparatus will affect these culturally and politically significant processes. The catalogue of these new phenomena that can be found in the monograph may be perceived as the list of new challenges for scholars focusing on inevitable connections between new media and spheres of culture or politics.

Application of the research outcomes

I presented some of the research outcomes during domestic and abroad scientific conferences. During the *6th European Communication Conference* (Prague 2016) I presented the paper on '*The internets' as medium of reverse agency. Political Economy of New Media in the Frame of Bennett and Segerberg's Connective Action*. During ECREA's Media & Democracy section in Stockholm (*Digital Democracy: Critical Perspectives in the Age of Big Data*, 2017) I discussed the problem of post-truth as related to the cultural logic of new media

reconstructed in my book (the title: *Discourse of post-truth in algorithmic culture*). During the anniversary conference of Polish Social Communication Association in Wrocław, 2017, I talked about *Hacking democracy. Digital mediatization of democratic process*. I also presented partial outcomes of my research, like those on the cultural status of online media genres (*Asymmetric dialectic of media* – characterizing online media genres, “Contemporary media – media genres”, Lublin, 2016), or their uses as medium of collective articulation processes (*Pepe on Polish paths – about cultural migrations of memes*, presented at III Culture Studies Association Congress in Poznań, 2017), and, not last, those about methodological issues related to research for the monograph (*About social semiotics as a research tool for analyzing popular culture online*, “Contemporary media – multimodal media”, Lublin 2017). Some of the research outcomes have been integrated into my teaching courses at Faculty of Political Science of MCSU (facultative courses on Media Production and Journalism and Social Communication study programs) as well as at Johannes Gutenberg University in Mainz where I had lectures for students of Journalism Department within Erasmus+ mobility program (2018).

I use the research outcomes also as a starting point in my further scientific endeavor. Firstly, I refer to particular empirical outcomes in my academic work on relations between cultural logic of new media and phenomena like post-truth, cultural articulation using pop-cultural modalities; patterns of local (national) adaptation of global popular culture online. Secondly, theoretical concepts from the book are useful during making plans of the future research: my ideas how to ‘use’ Stuart Hall’s or Michel Foucault’s theories and ‘dictionaries’ to operationalize new media are a strong foundation for the future research work of mine. I have already published – after publishing the book – the paper in “Przegląd Kulturoznawczy” (‘Culture Studies Review’) [2] on the issue of popular culture online as the sphere of articulation. Other papers, focusing at political contexts of internet memes’ adaptations and post-truth in the light of Foucault’s theory are at various stages of publishing process in Poland and abroad. Finally, the reconstruction of the discursive status of new media has been one of the foundations of the international research project (2017-2018) co-financed by Polish-German Foundation for Science. The research was designed after writing the monograph and the project is strongly based on the notion of the discursive status of new media, in particular: their cultural depiction as technology of privacy shared by civil society agents⁵.

Description of other scientific achievements

The rest (‘after-PhD’) of my academic output consist of reviewed scientific articles published in journals and monographs. In numbers, it is 29 articles: six published in scientific journals – one paper [1] was published in “Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication” indexed in Journal Citation Reports, and four [2;3;4;5] in three journals that can be found in European Reference Index for the Humanities: “Central European Journal of Communication”, “Przegląd Kulturoznawczy”, “Nowe Media”. The rest 23 papers were published in monographs. Six papers were published in English [1; 3; 13; 14; 18; 29], the other 23 in Polish.

⁵ A broader description of the project is in the later part of this document.

Theme-wise, most of these papers concern issues related to **citizen engagement online**, especially when it uses popular culture online as a kind of ‘language’ (for example when protesters use internet media genres like memes, machinima or fake trailers), symbolic spaces of action (protests organized in pop-cultural online environments like virtual social platforms or commercial entertainment profiles online), or as subject of analyzed action (like the anti-ACTA movement). Most of these publications can be seen as a halfway stage between PhD and presented monograph.

The first group of papers focus at activism online and comprises mostly **case studies** in which civic engagement online is also participation in popular culture. Anti-ACTA protests in 2012 belong to this category. The bottom-up movement against ACTA is a phenomenon having a special position among my research interests. I analyze it in an extensive part of my book and also in several articles [1;2; 21; 29] to which I refer in the book when recalling these articles’ research outcomes. The most important one [1], entitled *The Good, the Bad, and the Commons: A Critical Review of Popular Discourse on Piracy and Power During Anti-ACTA Protests*, consists of empirical research⁶ of the Polish bottom-up popular discourse against the agreement. ACTA opponents used the global language of popular culture online to perform political action: objects from the sphere of popular culture (like internet memes) have been used as medium of a coherent serious citizen message. New media worked as tool and space of spontaneous political activity. They also appeared in the analyzed discourse as one of the key *subjects* of the protest, that is, a sphere of socialization, participation in culture and civic expression, symbolized by ‘common’ everyday practices of internet usage. Thus, the internet was defined as ‘the commons’ that everyone should have access to and use rights. Global popular culture was appropriated to the local context: most of ACTA opponents depicted in analyzed memes came from global repository of pop-cultural characters (movies, cartoons, comic-books, games) and protesters used already existing content against similar regulations originated in US Congress: Stop Online Piracy Act/Protect IP ACT (SOPA/PIPA). In the paper I also analyzed other important issues, like the problem of ambiguous political status of new media as space of the protest – ACTA opponents used mainly ‘platforms’ provided by agents interested in the collapse of the agreement.

This article is especially important for me also because of where it was published: “Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication” is on the part A of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education journals’ list and is granted with maximum amount of 50 points for the publication. The journal is published under the auspices of International Communication Association by American Pennsylvania State University and is among the best scientific journals in the field of media studies: its impact factor is 4,113 for the year of publication of my article, and the journal is 2/79 in the category of Communication in the ISI Journal Citation Reports ranking.

Another paper focusing at the anti-ACTA protests [28] was entitled *On Anti-ACTA: soft (media) power and pleasures of symbolic protest*. The article analyzes activities of the protesters in the activism studies theoretical perspective: particular kinds of anti-ACTA engagement can be analyzed as examples of cyberactivism or e-mobilization on all three levels of practices of this kind: 1) raising awareness and expressing support/disapproval for

⁶ The analysis is based on systematic (3 intercoders, *Krippendorff alpha* for particular categories ranging 0.807-0.880) interpretation of visual materials: 921 ACTA-related images shared by Polish internet users in 2012 analyzed by the social semiotics method.

particular issue; 2) online mobilization for particular actions and their organization/coordination; 3) hacktivism – direct action online.

I wrote more papers with case studies of other citizen/pop-cultural activities online. Like the bottom-up protest analyzed in the paper [18] *Political Communication, Social Media and Popular Culture: The Adisucks Facebook Protest Case Study*. I analyzed communicative actions performed within Facebook *adisucks* Facebook profile, set up to protest against the Adidas company painting black a wall with a street-art gallery in Warsaw in 2011 (another article [23] also concerned the protest, in particular the status of content published by the protesters in the perspective of agenda setting theory). In the paper [22] I analyzed the internet meme (Pepper Spray Cop) that was also a global medium of spontaneous protest against brutality of US police. Finally, I also analyzed *Project Chanology as hacktivist action* [26] during which the Anonymous collective fought the Church of Scientology. These research, and also papers [5; 6; 11; 12; 15; 20] have shown big potential of new media as tools for citizen action. The contemporary media ecosystem, firstly, facilitates distribution of information and can be conducive to attempts of reaching mainstream media agendas. Secondly, new online media genres may strengthen particular citizen activities because of ideology connoted by them: people, when perceiving particular content as ‘their own’ (which means by referring them to people’s economic/political/cultural situation), take part in processes of articulation. These actions are, however, performed in very distinctive environments of increasingly commercialized and non-transparent new media which makes evaluations of new media as spaces of analyzed activities more ambiguous.

The second thematic field of my research output since 2009 are papers on **digital mediatization of popular culture**. Obviously, this field is connected to already mentioned publications – diagnoses of changes in participation in popular culture are one of the preconditions for accurate interpretations of contemporary online activism. A good example of such ‘inter-field’ characteristics is the article published in “Przegląd Kulturoznawczy” [2] entitled *Memowe wojny, artykulacja i Stuart Hall. O strukturalnych uwarunkowaniach sieciowej popkultury* (*Meme wars, articulation, and Stuart Hall. On structural conditions of popular culture online*). The paper analyzes collective interpretative practices online by using examples of online communities of Donald Trump’s supporters. I use some of the argument from the monograph as theoretical contextualization: theory of articulation has lead me to questions on how the market status of new media affects on how they are used as environment for the analyzed processes. The problem gains importance as new media have become one of the dominant (if not already the leading) technology of representation – the obfuscated nature of digital code and its market conditions define limits and forms of these activities, and – by moderation policies, copyright interpretations, or catalogues of social practices imposed on users – they make decisions on visibility and invisibility of content online.

I also recalled Stuart Hall’s thought in the paper on *Internet meme as meaningful discourse: Towards a theory of multiparticipant popular online content* [3], published in ‘Central European Journal of Communication’. I referred to Hall’s seminal model of media program as ‘meaningful discourse’ co-created in the processes of encoding and decoding by producers and media audiences. I adapted Hall’s model to the analysis of internet memes appropriating Hall’s dialectics of professional media/media audiences to the current situation in which media genres online have become truly of multiple authorship as there are three groups of agents participating in their production, distribution, reception, and reconstruction: traditional

culture industry, new culture industry, and increasingly active recipients – all entangled in complex mutual interests, policies, alliances, and conflicts. Other papers from the field of **internet genres studies** are: the analysis of machinima as new online media genre [24] and theoretical considerations on contemporary visual remixes online [20]. Other papers exploring the subject of popular culture online are methodological article titled *O badaniu kultur popularnych online (Researching online popular culture)* [19], and another case studies: internet memes on the hipster phenomenon [29] and so called Rules of internet [27] – open and collectively written system of conventions reflecting discursive features of the internet as culture environment.

The third general thematic field of my articles since 2009 are structural conditions of the internet. These are works on various aspects of new media in general, usually older ones – written mostly in the first years after gaining PhD. They are attempts at finding regularities in complex chaotic transformations of converging media in XXI century. These papers focus at various aspects and effects of rapid development of social media (I would label their providers as digital intermediaries a few years later), in particular: how they affected media messages flows [4; 9; 14]; changes in media audiences practices [6]; relations between professional and bottom-up media content [23]. In the today's perspective, these publications concern one of the key issues for media studies of that time: explaining social, political, cultural effects of digital intermediaries development. I perceive these phenomena in much more critical way nowadays than when I wrote these articles. In other words, these articles can be perceived as – at least to some extent – as a part of the Web 2.0 discourse I critically analyze in my monograph.

A few another papers [7; 8; 10; 25] focus at the issue of **internet as space for debates** – mainly public/political one. These are publications that continue some of arguments from my PhD thesis. They broaden and update them which was necessary because of transformations of the internet since the end of the first decade of XXI century.⁷ The rest of my papers are not related to my main research topics. One of them [17] focuses at popular music as the sphere of participation in popular culture. Other, written with Agnieszka Stępińska, Szymon Ossowski, and Lidia Pokrzycka [13], is a small-scale depiction of Polish professional journalism and is a part of prestigious Routledge's anthology *The Global Journalist in 21st Century*, edited by David Weaver and Lars Willnat.

2011 is a year of the publication of the monograph *Aktywność obywateli online. Teorie a praktyka (Citizen engagement online. Theories and practice)* [30] which is my slightly modified PhD thesis. I also co-edited (with Włodzimierz Mich) an anthology *Wokół teorii stosunków międzynarodowych (On the theory of international relations)* [31]. Thematic field of that book is obviously beyond my research interests as it consists of papers of Polish international relations scholars that are a follow-up of the discussion started by articles in the “Annales UMCS Sectio K: Politologia” scientific journal run by Włodzimierz Mich as Editor in Chief (I worked as the journal's Editor assistant during that period). Finally, I think that it is worth to mention about one of my two [32; 33] scientific interviews I conducted. I participated in “Communicative Figurations” conference organized by ZeMKI, Centre for

⁷ The first part of the article on *Internet as the space for debates* [25] is a shorter and updated version of a part of my after-PhD monograph *Citizen engagement online. Theories and practice* [30] which was stated in the article. This is due to the specific character of the publication to which I contributed by this article: *Sztuka debaty (The Art of Debate)* is a handbook being one of the outcomes of the project Gdańsk Debate Academy.

Media, Communication and Information Research at Bremen University where I interviewed (On the concept of figurations, deep mediatization, and the adulthood of media and communication studies) Andreas Hepp for the “Mediatization Studies” scientific journal. Hepp, the leader of ZeMKI, is a co-author (with Nick Couldry) of the monograph *The Mediated Construction of Reality* that had its premiere during the conference.

The overall **impact factor** of my publications according to Journal Citation Reports (JCR) is 4,1113 (so these are points only for the article published in “Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication”). The **citation index** for my publications is as following: Web of Science (Wos): 5; Publish or Perish: 50; Google Scholar 34. Hirsch Index also depends on the database: WoS: 1; Publish or Perish: 4; Google Scholar: 3.

My publication activities are closely connected to **conference activities**. In 2009-2017 I presented papers at 37 conferences: 9 in English and 28 in Polish. Among international abroad conferences, I wish to underline my active participation especially in congresses organized by European Communication Research Association: „Communication for Empowerment: Citizens, Markets, Innovations” organized in Universidade Lusofona in Lisbon (2014) and „Mediated (Dis)Continuities: Contesting Pasts, Presents and Futures” in Charles University in Prague (2016) – during both I presented in the panels of Media & Democracy section, with the papers on *Civic engagement and popular culture converged. A critical review of popular discourses of protest in Polish anti-ACTA online videos* and on *‘The internets’ as medium of reverse agency. Political Economy of New Media in the Frame of Bennett and Segerberg’s Connective Action*. Other prestigious scientific symposiums in which I presented my papers are ‘Pirating the Popular: Popular Culture and World Politics’ conference organized by Stockholm University (2013) as well as ECREA Media & Democracy Section Conference: ‘Digital Democracy: Critical Perspectives in the Age of Big Data’ (2017) at Södertörn University (Stockholm). Among other international conferences I attended there are also periodic CEECOM Central and East European Communication and Media Conferences (Kraków 2011, Wrocław 2014; I will participate in 2018 edition in University of Szeged in Hungary). I took part in media studies scientific conferences (including congresses of Polish Social Communication Association 2013, 2016) as well as interdisciplinary, political science (National Congresses of Political Science 2012, 2015), culture studies (III Congress of Polish Culture Studies Association, 2017) conferences.

My conference activities not only improved my academic development (by confronting theoretical concepts/research outcomes with other scholars) but to some extent also enabled the start of my **grant activeness**. During panels of the Media & Democracy section at ECREA conferences I met dr Johanna Moeller from the Journalism Department of Johannes Gutenberg University in Mainz in Germany. The cooperation resulted in the international research project *Überwachung und Privatsphäre im digitalen Zeitalter – geteilte Geschichte, gemeinsame Perspektiven? / Nadzór i prywatność w erze cyfrowej – podobne doświadczenia, wspólne perspektywy?* (Surveillance and privacy in the digital age – common experience, common perspectives?). The project is financed by Polish-German Foundation for Science (PNFN 2017, nr 200428) in 2017-2018 and has two project directors (me and Johanna Moeller) at Maria Curie-Skłodowska University and at JGU in Mainz. The most important activities within the project are: 1) an international seminar on *The Design of Digital Privacy Technology – Political and Societal Potentials* organized at Faculty of Political Science of MCSU in Lublin 2018 gathering European scholars in the field of media as surveillance

technologies and legislators and NGO experts from Poland and Germany; 2) a special issue of “Mediatization Studies” journal (vol. 2/2018) with the theme of *Surveillance, encryption and privacy in the digital age* (guest editors: Jakub Nowak and Johanna Moeller); 3) comparative research (Poland, Germany) on the perception of new media as technologies of privacy/surveillance by civil society agents; 4) presenting the outcomes during European media studies conferences + in papers published in international scientific journals. My cooperation with dr Moeller will be continued after the end of the project: we have already started preparations for applying for funding in the next edition of the Beethoven grant contest for Polish-German research projects founded by National Centre for Science (NCN) and Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG) at the end of 2018.

The rest of my research activities include numerous other academic functions and projects. I have been a member of Polish Social Communication Association since 2012 and a member of *European Communication Research Association* since 2014. During 2008-2015 I worked as editor assistant in “Annales UMCS Sectio K: Politologia”, a scientific journal published by Faculty of Political Science of MCSU in Lublin. During the period of my work as editor assistant, the journal’s editorial staff (prof. dr hab. Włodzimierz Mich was the Editor in chief by 2012, when he resigned and prof. dr hab. Maria Marczewska-Rytko took the lead) took effective effort to improve the journal’s position within the national system of academic journals – by the decision of Ministry of Science and Higher Education the scoring for publishing in the journal was raised from 2 points before 2012 to 12 points in 2015. I am the founding-member of Editorial Staff of “Mediatization Studies” (prof. dr hab. Iwona Hofman holds the position of the Editor in chief), an English-language scientific journal devoted to theoretical and empirical works in the field of broadly understood mediatization.

I have been also engaged in organizing conferences at Faculty of Political Science at MCSU. I was the Chief Organizer of the aforementioned seminar *The Design of Digital Privacy Technology. Political and Societal Potentials* (2018). I was also a member of the Organizing Committee of the *5th ECREA Radio Research Section Conference*, organized at Faculty of Political Science at MCSU, a member of Organizing Committee of II Congress of Media Education. Practices of Media Education (Lublin 2016) during which I organized and chaired the panel ‘Contemporary media practices in the context of challenges for media education’; as well as *IPSA’s RC21-29 International Expert Conference* organized at Faculty of Political Science at MCSU in Lublin (2014).

I was granted with the Brown Order of Merit by the President of Poland for my academic work. I was also granted with the II Level Rector’s of MCSU Individual Award for especially valuable scientific paper (article published in ‘Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication’) in 2016. I was also awarded with the Order of Polish Minister of Culture for Merits for Science-Fiction and ‘Fantastyka’ Literary Magazine⁸.

Since the very beginning of my work at Faculty of Political Science of MCSU I have been involved not only in **didactic activities** but also other projects and activities related to didactics and **popularization of science** and university. I hold the position of Faculty Coordinator of Erasmus+ and other programs of student exchange (2012-2013, 2016 till now).

⁸ The order granted by the Minister of Culture is related to my literary activities: I am the author of science-fiction stories published in literary magazines (mostly “Nowa Fantastyka”) and in the anthology “Amnezjak” published by Powergraph in 2017.

I participated in Erasmus+ program also as academic lecturer for students of Saint Cyril and Methodius University in Trnava (Slovakia 2013), Granada University (Spain 2014), Johannes Gutenberg University in Mainz (Germany 2018). I was also a supporting supervisor of two PhD theses at Faculty of Political Science: 1) Łukasz Goniak's *Redefinicja zawodu dziennikarza w dobie konwergencji mediów* (*Redefining a journalist occupation in the age of media convergence*), (supervisor: prof. dr hab. Marek Jeziński, 2017); 2) Kinga Jarmołowicz's *Obywatelska e-partycypacja w działaniach samorządu miasta Lublin w latach 2010-2016* (*Citizen e-participation in Lublin's minicipal self-government 2010-2016*) (supervisor: prof. dr hab. Iwona Hofman, 2018). I was a member of: Faculty Team for Media Production teaching program (2013); Faculty Team for 3 degree program in Media Studies (2016); Faculty Team for National Framework for Qualifications and Teaching Effects (2012).

I teach courses on all 3 levels of programs within my teaching obligations at Faculty of Political Science of MCSU. My present and former lectures, labs, and conversatory classes are: *Teorie komunikowania masowego* (*Theory of mass communication*), *Mediatyzacja polityki* (*Mediatization of Politics*), *Społeczeństwo sieci* (*Network Society*), *Konwergencja mediów* (*Media convergence*), *Media alternatywne* (*Alternative media*), *Historia komunikowania politycznego* (*History of political communication*), *Sieciowe popkultury* (*Popular culture online*) and in English: *Popular Cultures Online*, *Media Convergence*, *Network Society*; as well as courses at Media Production study program (1 and 2 level of study): *Teorie mediów* (*Media theories*), *Podstawy komunikowania sieciowego* (*Network communication: basics*), *Semiotyka kultur popularnych* (*Semiotics of popular culture*), *Antropologia mediów* (*Media anthropology*), *Obrazy technologii w popkulturze* (*Pop-cultural depictions of technology*). I also give a lecture for PhD students on *Media Semiotics*.

I realize my teaching and popularization obligations also beside academic environment. I cooperated with Third Age University in Lublin: gave lectures on mass and new media (2009-2012) and semester-long seminar on media theories (2012-2015). I also run lectures for high schools' students during Lublin Science Festival (2007-2017) and held the position of the Faculty Coordinator of Lublin Science Festival at Maria Curie-Skłodowska University during 2013-2015. I gave lectures for participants of Debate Academy in Gdańsk during 2014-2015. I also organized and gave many presentations about social and cultural aspects of media for high school students of Lublin and cities and towns in the region (Chełm, Świdnik, Łuków, Lubartów and others in 2009-2015). As a media expert, I participated in many debates, meetings and scientific panels organized by civil society organizations and popular culture conventions in Poland. I am the author of many expert statements for „Press”, „Przegląd”, „Rzeczpospolita”, „Gazeta Wyborcza”, „Newsweek”, „Dziennik Wschodni”, „Kurier Lubelski”, Radio Lublin, Polskie Radio PR1, Akademickie Radio Centrum.

