Approaches Post-Cinema – Section Editor: Greg Singh

To be published in *Routledge International Handbook of Jungian Film Studies*, ed. by L

Hockley, Routledge International Handbooks, Hove: Routledge, 2018

Beyond the second screen: Enantiodromia and the running-together of connected viewing

Greg Singh

Introduction

In his influential 1948 essay 'Le Camera Stylo', Alexandre Astruc writes that:

> Up to now the cinema has been nothing more than a show. [...] The day is not far
> off when everyone will possess a projector, will go to the local bookstore and hire
> films written on any subject, of any form [...]. From that moment on, it will no
> longer be possible to speak of the cinema. There will be *several* cinemas.

> (1968, p. 19 [emphasis in original]).

Although writing from the technological perspective of the 1940s, here Astruc is
remarkably prescient: for not only is he speculating the extension of film distribution
and viewing beyond cinema theatres (and into homes and libraries). He is also
commenting on new developments in portability, as well as the evolution of film culture
itself and crucially, the possibilities in what people would do to actively seek out
infotainment experiences, given the access to technology and the opportunities
afforded. The predictions discernible in Astruc's statement range from video hire (from
both municipal and commercial sources) and interaction between technology (Web-
based infrastructure) and distribution networks and apparatus (historical examples
include Blockbuster and lovefilm, superseded by Netflix and other popular streaming
sites and content providers; but also the continuation of municipal systems such as
public library loans in the UK). Therefore, one may say that in terms of delivery, film

narrative and the kinds of storytelling to which so-called Classical film narrative lends itself, has always relied upon multiplicity of access, novel innovation, and technological development. In Astruc, there is also a useful theoretical precedence which this chapter seeks to use: to realise a theory of 'several cinemas' in the context of convergent, multiplatform viewing cultures, and through the post-cinematic concept of 'connected viewing'.

In their editorial introduction to a special issue of *Convergence* on the theme of connected viewing, Holt, Steirer and Petruska (2016) state that 'Connected viewing essentially refers to the multiple ways viewers engage with media in a multiscreen, socially networked, digital entertainment experience' (2016, p. 342). Media scholarship has tackled this in a number of ways according to specific themes and approaches. These might include audience engagement and participatory culture (Jenkins, et. al., 2013; Shirky, 2008; van Dijck, 2013); power relations in connected media environments (especially Andrejevic 2013); and the political economy of the digital world (Allmer 2015; Fuchs 2013, 2015; and, Labato and Thomas, 2015). In all of these themes and approaches, however, there are a couple of important constants that underpin the principle of connected viewing. The first is the acknowledgement that this arena of academic study is fast-moving, and often seems quite ephemeral when compared with other traditional academic areas in the Arts and Humanities. Secondly, to me it is clear that the active role of the participant in driving the development (and indeed contributing to the accelerating pace of change in this area, thanks to the power of demand-driven evolution of converged media cultures) is crucial. As a media and cultural studies scholar whose main task is to address this connected media environment and the place of cultural production within this context, in a critical way, the challenge is clear. This is complicated by the fact that I am also a media and cultural studies scholar who seeks to understand some of the crucial questions around active participation through the lens of depth psychology. This emerging area of post-Jungian media studies is very young, but not without precedent.

Participative and connected viewing and the Post-Jungian studies context

In the Summer of 2009, *Screen* gave Luke Hockley, Chris Hauke and I the opportunity to form a panel to present papers on the theme of 'Film Analysis and Post-Jungian Approaches to Participative Viewing' at the annual conference in Glasgow. Although there may have been papers given from classical perspectives in years gone by, to our knowledge this was the first time that a panel had convened around the theme of post-Jungian film analysis at *Screen*. The session was (to our delight) oversubscribed in terms of audience attendance, and provided a rare and most welcome opportunity to engage colleagues working in film and media studies at an international level. At that event, we had decided to address a specific problem, identified independently by each of us in very different ways: the problem of participatory viewing. Surprisingly, perhaps, for an approach that places such an emphasis on human psyche, Jungian film analysis often forgets that there is a flesh-and-bone human being at the heart of the viewing act; and further, that the co-production of meaning-making in the relationship between viewer and viewed tends to get lost in acts of interpretation when conducting close textual analysis, especially when using a derivative of classic Screen Theory in the analytic process and even more so when the primary object of analysis is the author, and authorial intentionality.

Indeed, this problem of participatory viewing (and the attendant issues associated with Jungian textual analysis) was one of the centrepieces of my argument in *Film After Jung* (Singh 2009), a monograph dedicated to rethinking film theory in relation to concepts driven through analytical psychology. We discussed our different approaches to the cultural and psychic dimensions of subject and agency in contemporary, participatory viewing practices and touched upon how the notion of co-creation of meaning, particularly in the world of post-cinematic technologies and repeated viewing practices

tends to get utterly lost. What we uncovered through discussion that day in 2009, arguably a touchstone for so much work in post-Jungian media and cultural studies since, is what I would describe as the need to acknowledge the 'warm psychology' of the contemporary cinematic encounter (Singh, 2014). This contemporary cinematic encounter has remained participatory in its aspect, but through shifts in media ecologies, has more recently come to resemble something that can be described as 'connected viewing'. I argue that these participatory, connected viewing practices, often discernibly technological in character, embody a warm psychology, driven through what post-Jungians describe as the 'third image' (Hockley, 2014; Singh 2014, pp. 4-6).

Admittedly, it is all-too-easy to slip into an interpretative mode of film criticism when using the tools of analytical psychology. In close textual analysis, the temptation might be to unpick meaning from thematic devices in cinematic texts – artefacts that seem 'pregnant with meaning' or somehow 'ripe'. This rather literal approach to analysis reflects a tendency that characterises some of the more influential Jungian-influenced film criticism published to date (e.g. Fredericksen, 2001; Izod, 2001). In the past, I might have been vocal in my criticisms of this kind of classical approach (2009, 2011, 2014). With hindsight, however, I can acknowledge that there is still work to be done where classical Jungian film criticism can provide real insights for close textual analysis, as well as for traditional modes of film criticism. A rather good example of this can be found in Izod and Dovalis's remarkable book *Cinema as Therapy* (2015), and there are many shorter examples in the present volume.

However, there are a number of reasons for my erstwhile position. In many ways, although softened through the years, my criticisms of such approaches maintain the same logic. Jungian analysis has always concerned itself with images, and in particular, the psychological production of images in relation to the individual's experience. It therefore makes sense that the 'canon' of work relating to Jungian film analysis has devoted itself to (especially) visual interpretation as its main analysis object. (The field -

if it can be called such - is now maturing and subsequent generations of work are beginning to emerge exponentially as attested to by this volume.) This specular-ocular focus is, of course, not without its own problems. I will touch upon this in relation to my subject later on in this chapter, but a full discussion of this issue in relation to the phenomenology of affective viewing may be found elsewhere (Singh, 2014; Hockley, 2014).

I have argued (2009, 2011, 2014) and extend the argument here, that there are a number of ways that post-Jungian approaches seek to move beyond the classical position as a matter of course – 'classical' in the textual traditions of both Jungian film criticism and British film criticism; and to embrace the lived, embodied, affective aspects of the cinematic encounter as the main object for analysis. There are plenty of examples (Hockley, 2014; Hauke and Hockley eds., 2011; Hockley and Fadina eds., 2015) to evidence a concerted effort in post-Jungian theory and criticism to extend the methodological tools and conceptual frameworks of analytical psychology beyond what might be described (albeit rather harshly) as a rather *passive* textual approach. I would say that this is especially so in the context of post-cinema encounters, where the notion of texts as isolated incidents of cultural production and consumption makes little sense.

My own perspective is shaped by innovations in the field of post-Jungian depth psychology and its potential to provide an understanding of the psychic, unconscious and archetypal processes at work in the production and consumption of culture. Post-Jungian ideas have been applied to a number of Arts and Humanities fields, but perhaps most successfully in film theory and criticism. The rapid growth in this scholarship is an indicator of the speed at which the very different fields of film studies and post-Jungian studies are moving (see, for example, Hauke and Alister eds., 2000; Hauke and Hockley eds., 2011; Hockley, 2007, 2014; Bassil-Morozow, 2010; Izod, 2001, 2006; Izod and Dovalis, 2015; Singh, 2009, 2014). This growth might reasonably be extended to more traditional forms of television and media studies, which are also

continued from post-Jungian perspectives (Hockley and Gardner eds., 2011; Waddell, 2006; Hockley and Fadina eds., 2015). However, there are at present still very few post-Jungian or depth-psychological interventions in the field of contemporary digital media cultures. Notable exceptions being edited collections, e.g. Weitz ed., 2014; a special issue of *The Spring Journal* on the theme of technology, cyberspace and psyche, Winter 2008; and book-length studies by Balick, 2014b; and Singh, 2017, and forthcoming.

To summarise, the post-Jungian approach that I am taking in this chapter is to extend the frame of analysis in a number of crucial directions, using the Jungian and post-Jungian concepts of *enantiodromia*, and the phenomenology of the 'third image', as tools for conducting critical inquiry into the cultural practices of connected viewing. In doing so, I consider the warm psychology of the post-cinematic encounter that exists *beyond the text* (in the third image, co-produced sense of meaningfulness in the psychological space between viewer and viewed); *beyond the high/low cultural distinction* so often found in the choices of objects in more traditional, Jungian-inflected close textual reading; and finally in conclusion, *beyond cinema* itself in contemporary converged multiplatform entertainments. I consider how the contemporary media eco system provides post-Jungian approaches to analysis and criticism a frame for rethinking the 'post-cinema' concept, especially given the contexts of home cinema technologies, shared cultural practices, and the consumption practices of 'second-screening' that accompany connected viewing today.

Connected viewing: Beyond the text

As I have noted elsewhere, there are many challenges facing film and media studies today (Singh, 2017). I argue that one of the most important challenges to acknowledge is the rapid acceleration of a media ecosystem in popular culture through which people communicate, share, and seek escape from everyday life. Indeed, this seems to be a

central driver for media studies. In particular, the sub-discipline of celebrity studies seeks to explore the parasocial and participatory aspects of these phenemena, with a focus in this context on online streaming and Video on Demand (VoD) services (see, for example, Cunningham, Craig and Silver, 2016; Lashley, 2013). While it may be clear that the contemporary media ecosystem is both an extension and continuation of more traditional media forms, the acceleration effect that accompanies this connectivity presents a set of specific problems. In particular, in relation to the way that media scholars now need to approach innovations in technology, institutions, financial arrangements, and consumer or end-user behaviours as fundamentally connected and part of a holistic, intra-related ecosystem (Singh, 2017; Krüger and Johanssen, 2014).

To an extent, this was certainly always the case. Cinema studies, for example, has recognised for some time now, the need to engage narrative encounters across multiple access points and migratory content across convergent platforms, industries and audience behaviours (King, 2002; Jenkins, 2006; Singh, 2014). Locating this within a sustainable conceptual framework robust enough to stand up alongside the rapid changes in technology and consumer practice has proven difficult, but a number of commentators have attempted to do so.

Henry Jenkins has termed the kind of narrative world-building and flow of content across media delivery platforms found in connected media environments as 'transmedia storytelling'. Put simply, this is 'a process where integral elements of a fiction get dispersed systematically across multiple delivery channels for the purpose of creating a unified and coordinated entertainment experience' (2007). As Jenkins notes, 'Moving characters from books to films to video games can make them stronger and more compelling' (2003). However, the primary concern here is commercial. Building a stronger story-world, according to Jenkins, 'can sustain multiple characters (and their stories) and thus successfully launch a transmedia franchise.' Additionally, as Jenkins states in the on-line Technology Review (2003):

We have entered an era of media convergence that makes the flow of content across multiple media channels almost inevitable. […] Everything about the structure of the modern entertainment industry was designed with this single idea in mind – the construction and enhancement of entertainment franchises.

One can see how Jenkins has arrived at this conclusion, but his most telling insight with regard to the strength of transmedia storytelling is that 'Reading across the media sustains a depth of experience that motivates more consumption.' This suggests that the structure of the modern entertainment industry and its convergence of delivery platforms has not merely a creative-, but also a commercially-orientated tendency. However, in terms of the audience's encounter with narrative, such multi-layered, convergent delivery enables 'a more complex, more sophisticated, more rewarding mode of narrative to emerge within the constraints of commercial entertainment' (2003).

The narrative strategies employed in mainstream media productions, engaging the services of online content producers, digital advertising and mobile media therefore seem to fit Frederic Jameson's idea of the 'megapicture': an idea that describes a postmodern, hypertextual event within popular cinema cultures, rather than a discrete, hermetic or 'pure' text or set of singular texts (1992). There are other scholars who give equal emphasis to event or ritual to content, and these ideas have become fairly influential in the field of cinema studies. For example, in *Visible Fictions*, John Ellis states that two things are bought and sold through ticket sales at the box office: the film as a differentiated commodity, and the cinema as a familiar cultural practice (1992, pp. 25-27). This suggests that, in the context of viewing film in a cinema theatre, the 'event' or ritual of 'going to the movies' is a valuable commodity itself. It is clear that two of the things that differentiate a film from its viewing context are the viewing experience itself and the anticipation of what that experience promises to be. Thus, the duration of the

narrative (and the work of the narrative, in a psychological sense where anticipation holds so much emotional investment in readiness) can be said to extend beyond the duration of the screening of a text, and can be associated with the external world of ritual as well as the internal world of imagination. In this sense, narrative encounter can be configured, at least conceptually, as a kind of running-together – an *enantiodromic* movement – between ritual and imagination.

This differentiation between text and viewing context is a powerful commercial device that has been exploited time and again in cinema, and can lead to a cultural association with the event of the theatrical release as a more 'valuable' experience than home viewing. However, it should be noted that this is not to generalise the home viewing process as an inferior process, nor to suggest that people generally prefer to see a film at the cinema theatre. In fact, the historic advent of television (and therefore, television culture) brought with it certain viewing pleasures specific to that medium regarded as both separate from, and fundamentally tied-up with, the fate of cinema. What this valuation does suggest is that media ecology has become increasingly undifferentiated due to convergence of both technologies and the experience of viewing within several viewing contexts. Indeed, television culture today is saturated with example of 'event TV' where live broadcasts are promoted through the opportunity for viewers to participate in the broadcast as it unfolds through their use of social media and apps on hand-held or mobile devices (see, for example James Blake's description of *Coronation Street Live*, 2016). As I will go on to discuss, this most often happens sometimes concurrently in practices of 'media stacking' in multitasking scenarios: a usually simultaneous mixing of large, small, and hand-held screen media (most often used in social media and connected environments), defined by more recent terminology such as second-screening and connected viewing.

Media convergence, and digitality in particular, has posed some obvious challenges for film theory for some time now, particularly in relation to how one necessarily

approaches the notion of film-as-text in contemporary contexts. As Dan Harries acknowledged some time ago in *The New Media Book*, 'The material differences between media technologies have increasingly eroded and subsequently converged, and any discussion of a particular media technology will almost certainly rub up against other forms of technology' (2004, p. 1). In his essay 'The Business of New Media' in the same volume, John T. Caldwell noted that:

> The old media corporations – defined historically by the entertainment experience of the screen, the narrative, the star, and the genre – now work to calculate, amass, repackage, and transport the entertainment product across the borders of both new technologies and media forms.

> (2004, p. 63).

Although these two perspectives are quite dated in the specific media that they use as case studies, they are both very useful in thinking through the problem of media convergence, because they were written at a time when convergence as a concept was first gaining traction in orthodox cinema studies. These commentators highlight, one might say, a notion that convergence as a concept is itself a *convergent* problem. It has technological dimensions certainly, but these dimensions are impacted upon *by* shifts in media business as much as they are reflected *by* shifting business practice, and the artistic, aesthetic and textual aspects of cultural production associated with the practice of filmmaking and cinematic storytelling. It is an infinitely complex area already, and this is before we take into consideration (as a matter of necessity) the act of viewing and the cultural practices shared by audiences and user communities.

This is where the concept of connected viewing comes into its own. Holt and Sanson use the phrase to describe 'a larger trend across the media industries to integrate digital technology and socially networked communication with traditional screen media

practices' (2013, p. 1). However, this trend emerges through a wider aspect of convergent media culture that has become prevalent in popular culture. In their important intervention piece 'YouTube, multichannel networks and the accelerated evolution of the new screen ecology', Cunningham, Craig and Silver outline the emergence and virtual domination of multichannel networks (MCNs) as 'Arguably one of the most challenging and innovative elements of the evolving screen ecology [...] a low-budget tier of mostly advertising-supported online channels driven mainly by the professionalization and monetization of previously amateur content creation' (2016, p. 377).

Given this, further extension of this complexity into post-Jungian frames and concepts (indeed, in my view framed as what Singer and Kimbles, and others have described as a 'cultural complex' (eds. 2004)) is not without its challenges either. However, the approach that I took in *Feeling Film* (2014) attempted just that within the context of the affective and psychic economy of the all-around-all-at-once of the 'cinematic glance' (2014, especially Part II). It is also further complicated when one takes into consideration the pleasures of repeated viewing and the pleasurable recognition of archetypical elements through cultural familiarity with certain story-worlds (Singh, 2011). Arguably, this recognition process has gone into overdrive in the era of accelerated media evolution.

Film histories and analyses of films as formal systems (such as those proposed by David Bordwell 1985, 1996, 2006), tend to neglect the political implications of the varying modes of engagement with textuality available to the contemporary viewer over time. Textual analysis as a methodology in its classic mode requires an elucidation of what is on the screen, what happens within the frame, and what happens to the elements within the frame, in time. When one takes as the co-created relationship of viewer and viewed as an object of analysis, however, a number of issues present themselves as having an immediate impact upon what is being analysed, and why. For example, if the

way that people ordinarily watch films they love repeatedly (either via carrier media such as DVD or Blu-Ray, or via a streaming service – although this does not discount the fact that people still sometimes go to see movies at a theatre more than once), it fundamentally changes one's approach to textual analysis. What is being viewed within the frame is not only transformed through time, but also via medium, spatial context and viewer proximity (in both the sense of physical proximity to a screen, but also in the sense of cultural proximity, as in, their familiarity with the film's narrative). The foregrounding of the experience of the cinematic encounter is thus dialectically presented as an almost-simultaneous object for analysis alongside the 'film text' itself. The formal system of the text, and the phenomenological encounter of the co-created third image between viewer and viewed in the encounter are intertwined, and running-together in co-sequence.

There are precedents to this way of thinking around the primacy of textual analysis as an approach. An overview and comprehensive application of Bordwell's approach to texts as formal systems for example may be found in particular, in his 2006 book, *The Way Hollywood Tells It*. In this account, Bordwell demonstrates an understanding of the sophisticated synergistic business practices of media corporations, referring to Wasko (2003), Compaine and Gomery (2000) and Klinger (2006) amongst others in framing what he describes as a 'middle-level approach'. He demonstrates that there is a clear relationship between the conglomeration of the media and the film production system as big business, and the storytelling strategies employed by the products themselves. However, whereas there is much in this middle-level approach to be admired, not least in its rejection of hermeneutic analysis and polarisation of culturalism/determinism, there are a number of problems. The most important criticism to raise is that Bordwell stops short at the mechanistic political economy of Hollywood production. He never really considers why this is such an important factor, and fails to elaborate upon this mechanism as a determining factor (or not). Such an account of production economics is superficial, and does not negotiate the complexities of capitalist logic – a logic that

operates visibly in multinational corporate practice, but largely invisibly within the relationship between the commodity, the consumer, and the implicit content of the product itself.

To articulate this within a theoretical framework, Bordwell does not engage with the impact of form upon content in any meaningful way, and thus can never get to the notion of the articulation of form and content, one in the other, in the relationship between viewer and viewed – a point that currents in recent film theory have attempted to address in various ways. For example, in a phenomenological tradition following Vivian Sobchack's *The Address of the Eye* (1992) and *Carnal Thoughts* (2004), and Laura Marks' groundbreaking work, *The Skin of the Film* (2000), Jennifer M. Barker (2009) seeks to engage film's embodiment (as an articulation of form and content in the visceral viewing experience); Angela Ndalianis has identified a similar articulation of industry and aesthetics, noting that the morphing of the film industry itself into multiplatform content providers (of more generalised entertainment experiences) 'increased adeptness and reliance on digital technology' (2000, p. 253); and Stephen Keane (2007) has noted, in all but name, the articulation of form and content (one in the other) in film cultures, through matrices of technology, digital aesthetics, fandom, interactivity and branding.

According to Paul Lunenfeld, film narrative as encountered through convergent media through which access to content is enabled, regulated and modified, is characterised by 'sheer plenitude of narrative, exemplified by the glowingly accessible archive of everything' (2004, p. 151). The crucial step-change since Lunenfeld's piece was written is in the ways that connectivity, accompanied by the acceleration effects of connected viewing practices and cultural convergence, has altered the character of media ecology and one's experience as a viewer. YouTube and multichannel networks (MCNs) have been subject to accelerated evolution – and lying at the heart of contemporary, connected viewing ecology, this suggests that the MCN-driven ecosystems themselves

are subject to secondary acceleration effects. Cunningham, Craig and Silver state that 'the accelerated rate of change, in particular its professionalizing-amateur commercialization strategies, has now reached a level that demands critical analytical attention without such strategies being normatively framed against the brief period of pure YouTube amateurism and informality' (2016, p. 378). This would suggest a new strand of critical inquiry focused upon MCNs, but fully aware of the historical dimensions that accompany somewhat nostalgic normative frames of medium purity. Indeed, in some ways, MCNs represent an accelerated form or extension of Jameson's hypertextual event, mentioned above in relation to historical popular cinema practices.

These shifts have far-reaching implications in the study of convergence – in the deregulation, concentration and divestment of media ownership, but also in the ways that such industrial level shifts run-together with cultural practices focused around connected viewing. Cunningham, Craig and Silver mainly focus on the aspects of MCN connected viewing practices that reflect new multilevel industrial models of production, and control of content flow dominant in the corporate concentration/diversification models of the intermediary industry (in both so-called NoCal and SoCal production cultures). When one adds to this the complexity of the connected viewing encounter, and the third image movements that exist within such encounters, then this state of affairs suggests that the objects of analysis in popular media cultures are obscure, amorphous and multivalent.

Enantiodromia and mediated personality: Beyond high/low cultural distinctions

This situation precipitates a major concern for media studies scholars who are interested in psychological and humanist approaches to media. Accessibility of convergent media content, in its various formats, using various platforms and hardware, and from an array of access points, is becoming open to increasingly individual,

personalised choices. This condition lies at the very heart of what might be described as a Web 2.0 ethic of connectivity: the notion that media forms are inclusive, participatory, writable from the perspective of an end-user, immediate and, ultimately, democratised through practices of access, sharing and gift economies. At the front-end of these services, it would seem that the extent of that freedom of choice, of paramount importance in a deregulated media ecosystem, signifies an agency that is at once participatory and empowering. However, this has increasingly become prone to criticism from a number of disciplinary approaches where, even at this front-end of service provision, choice has an illusory dimension (see, for example, Zelenkauskaite, 2016). I refer here to the algorithms associated with streaming services, for example, Netflix, or YouTube, which operate within economies of attention and affect to present the consumer with front-end suggestions according to not only personal preferences based upon prior consumer choices (a narrowcast-based, 'pull' tendency), but also complexities associated with third-party arrangements for profile and data monetisation, and content provision (a more ostensibly broadcast-based 'push' tendency based on long-tail economic models and AI prediction technology).

A case in point here: various algorithms have been developed to increase market potential for YouTube content producers – note the use of that term, producers, which is a professionalised recuperation of the more interactive, amateur-ish produsage model often referred to in Web 2.0 scholarship (e.g. Bruns, 2008). To illustrate the extent of this recuperative turn, for example, intermediary firms DigitasLBi and Outrigger Media, have recently developed OpenSlate – a YouTube and social media analytics application designed to anticipate stars of the future before they break. The results of analysis guide investment choices for corporate players to develop new online talent, and decrease risks of such investments whilst simultaneously increasing the chances of return on investment. Essentially, according to Learmonth (2013), OpenSlate produces predictive, qualitative data of a kind not available from YouTube's own analytics systems. Webster (2014) states that OpenSlate tracks over fifty thousand

channels, and twenty-five million individual videos on YouTube, giving scores based upon specific qualitative criteria: audience engagement, frequency of new content added, influence and reach. For Webster:

> It's possible the talent identified in this way would hit it big without intervention. But using metrics to identify winners can create winners. Unlike the weather, social predictions can change outcomes'; and, unlike in the physical world, predictive 'algorithms powered by big data have the potential to create 'self-fulfilling prophecies' in the social world.

> (2014, p. 93).

One of the more radically-infused book-length critiques of this logic can be found in the work of Deborah Lupton. Lupton's *The Quantified Self* (2016), studies the forms and practices of self-tracking via various lifestyle applications powered by Web 2.0 connectivity, from a critical sociological perspective. These are popular self-tracking practices – the phenomenon of FitBit for example, or any number applications associated with measurements of body-mass indexing, jogging-route mapping, stepometers, and other wearable technologies or mobile phone applications all form familiar aspects of everyday media engagement, and with various connected screen interactions. The implications of Lupton's work also necessitate that one considers ways in which such practices partake of a broader culture associated with self-improvement, modification and technologies of well-being or work productivity within relations of power. I have discussed some of the intimate correlations and dialogues between self-image, lifestyle and cultures of self-improvement elsewhere (Singh, 2015) so I do not wish to repeat too much on that here, but it is noteworthy that such questions have begun to be addressed from a post-Jungian critique (indeed, for the range of subjects and positions taken on self-improvement and transformation, see the whole collection within which that specific work sits: Hockley and Fadina eds., 2015). The aspect of

Lupton's work that I would like to develop here through dialogue with post-Jungian ideas is how connected viewing articulates, in practice, her emphasis on the ways in which practices of self-tracking are 'spreading from the private realm into diverse social domains, and the implications of the self-tracking phenomenon for the politics of personal data, data practices and data materialisations' (2016, p. 1).

The contradictory elements suspended in this personality-driven media ecosystem are intertwined spectacle and everyday life, in the form of public and private identities. The contradictions are both tense (running-against) and complementary (running-together). One of the ways that post-Jungian approaches examine contradictions of this sort, is through the conceptual frame of *enantiodromia* – a 'running-together' of seeming opposites. In his essay *Psychological Types*, Jung described *enantiodromia* as the emergence of the unconscious opposite in the course of time and is a term used to designate the play of opposites in the course of events (1971). *Enantiodromia* is a term taken from Heraclitus, whose philosophy was largely predicated on the constancy of change. However, Heraclitus recognized that, whereas change is a predominance, it is not chaotic. Rather, it operates along continua; a running-together, running-against tension. For Sue Mehrtens (2012), in the field of psychology of personality, the more an attitude is repressed the more it acquires a fanatical character, and the nearer it comes to conversion into its opposite: an *enantiodromia*. Throughout his work, there are examples where Jung recognized the value of the concept of opposites, and particularly their interrelatedness in explicating the workings of the psyche. Indeed, in many ways this thinking forms the basis of Jungian psychological theory itself. There are many familiar examples in Jung where the emergence of unconscious material occurs when an extreme one-sided tendency dominates conscious life. In all instances, the common thread is that, over time, a countertendency builds, eventually breaking through conscious control, in the form of psychological union or accommodation.

For Luke Hockley (2014), this allows a psychological space of consideration for the messy, lived complexity of social phenomena, and the way that humans as intersubjective beings tend to engage contradiction in our dealings with one another. This lived complexity is as important for spaces of imagination as it is for social spaces of communication, and by extension, the co-produced relationships between individuals and groups in the social and the imaginal realms. In the context of cinema, for example, Hockley states that:

> Jung used the term *enantiodromia* [...] to suggest that opposites, far from pulling in different directions, in fact turn out to run into each other. When seen in this light it is apparent that the cinema is both a place of psychological encounter yet equally provides a safe space for this encounter to happen.

> (2014, p. 35).

Whereas cinema may be argued as a space *par excellence* of the social imaginary, so it would seem an almost natural exemplar of *enantiodromia* in its playful inhabitation of both the social and the imaginary; of ritual and imagination. YouTube is not cinema. Indeed, one must always be mindful of the qualitative differences and medium-specific character of each medium under discussion. It is additionally worth noting here a specific distinction, in that YouTube and other SNSs are not necessarily 'safe spaces' for these kinds of encounters, in contrast with the relatively safe spaces of cinema. One might include here the sorts of toxic disinhibition effects of online communications described by the social psychologist John Suler (2004), which are now part of the everyday fabric of social media communications – trolling, baiting, doxxing and general use of threatening language is a problem so common that it is difficult to see a way to even begin to tackle it. In what follows I touch upon this issue.

Just as for analytical psychology individuals exist within and contain contradictions and forces that are at odds, so too the personalities and performances for implied

audiences on YouTube embody contradiction and complexity. We might say that YouTube is both *anthropocentric*, in the sense of *for* human consciousness, in all its playful contradiction and complexity, and in the way it plays with our productive need to connect as social beings and share stories; and *enantiodromic*, in the sense that it embodies (and in an everyday, normal sense, pathologises) misrepresentation, through what is essentially the presentation and containment of two powerful contradictory forces which run together, without distinction: an mediated self, and a physical and conscious human subject.

Bringing these contradictions to the surface in considerations of media consumption, and suspending them in tension, is part of what Hockley describes as an *enantiodromic* exercise (2007). He writes that this pulling together of seemingly contradictory terms is essential to engage the role of culture in determining the expression of collective psychological encounters: '[...] in keeping with post-Jungian theory, which aims not to establish a lack (as in Freudian and particularly Lacanian theory) but rather to find a productive tension in bringing what might appear to be opposites together' (2007, p. 14).

Perhaps the most productive tension in the context of YouTube personalities and celebrity cultures within connected media environments is the blurred distinction between public and private in the identification, construction, and mobilisation of self. The immediacy and sheer speed of exchange, amplified through emotionally-charged celebrity culture, and engaged with by consumers of popular culture who are not only fans (or haters) of the celebrity figures themselves, means that consumer-users tend to be adept with the discourses featured in the communicative practices of platforms. Things tend to escalate very quickly under such intense circumstances. The voracity, extremity and self-belief, for example, that during the #Gamergate scandal, Gamergaters displayed in their dedication to discrediting female videogame developers, critics and commentators through multichannel engagement was deeply

troubling in its aggression (Singh, 2017). Well-known examples of this practice of trolling-as-lifestyle goal include the relentless attacks upon 'Tropes vs. Women in Video Games' Youtuber and 'Feminist Frequency' vlogger, Anita Sarkeesian. Indeed 'meninist' men's rights activist YouTubers such as NateTalksToYou, Thunderf00t, and dozens of others, have devoted entire YouTube *series* to discrediting her work. Comments on their posts often appear to endorse crossing multiple social boundaries to attack Sarkeesian on a personal level, punctuated with sexually violent language towards her or her family.

The *enantiodromic* movement works on two levels in this example. In the first place, the position of Sarkeesian as a public intellectual rests upon her professionalized use of Web 2.0 technologies to pursue and leverage audience reach. Her success is such that demands for content have Sarkeesian crowdfunding future work through social media campaigns. This itself has led to criticisms of her work ranging from drifting away from her video essay DIY roots, to criticisms of her using fans' money for her own private gain. At this purely technical level, Sarkeesian cannot win: her opponents use the same production conventions as weapons to undermine her position. At another level, the professionalized nature of her opposite numbers is in itself astonishing. Using the same levers and monetisation tactics as those attacked, these YouTube commentators have established norms in harnessing parasocial mechanisms of both identification and alienation to facilitate parallel careers.

They present as 'reality' – the logic of such right-wing critics relies on appeal to facts, logic and 'keeping things real' to succeed. Reality in this sense is a discursive and aesthetic principle through which the ritual of familiarity and belonging (specifically, in engaging a fanbase using a mode of address that is peer-to-peer) solicits emotional responses articulated as comments on video and textual content. The presentation of personae on the part of the content producers and the commentators tends to be that of a straightforward, authentic self-presentation. But even at a superficial level, analysis

uncovers processes of self-presentation by bloggers and commenters alike to be well-established (generic) practices. This occurs as a textual phenomenon for the YouTubers themselves (reflecting the tension between realism and spectacle in presentation and self-conscious performance). It also occurs as an interactive communications practice for end-users via comments, posts and even their own tribute video posts dedicated to YouTubers (activities reflecting the imaginal space of end-users in terms of their alignment, emotional investment and parasocial relationships with the celebrities). In the Sarkeesian case, as in other right-wing YouTuber cases, this even produces instances where fan videos are made in tribute to the critics of so-called 'Social Justice Warriors' (e.g. fan videos dedicated to NateTalksToYou). The point here is that the escalation into what can only be described as hate-filled practices on free speech platforms, ironically predicated on a perceived need to shut someone down, is sped up through the connected capabilities of the platforms themselves, without really tending to the damage such oscillation between extreme opposites can have upon collective consciousness. In cases of celebrity YouTuber-user interaction, because of public visibility, interaction is viewed by fan 'others' who tend to judge to standards in a 'defensive' style; due in part to their own emotional investment in those parasocial relationships, and partly due to collective dimensions of the *enantiodromic* movements described here.

Enantiodromia and convergence: Cinema beyond cinema

There are other aspects of connected viewing that relate to this idea of emotional investment and parasocial identification with 'real' others where, clearly, mediation occurs at multiple levels. In their work on 'Second-Screen Theory', Lee and Andrejevic (2014) claim that early instances of interactive television as it has developed through the emergence of digital television, provided a precedent for data collection through consumer activity (which, in the historical context of the UK in the early 2000s to give an

example, included Teletext, red button content, and emergent time-shifting and PVR technology such as Sky+, and later, Smart TV tech).

In other work, drawing from reports from CEA and NATPE, Zelenkauskaite (2016) has noted a number of emergent patterns in relation to second-screening as a popular cultural practice. Firstly, that second-screening has for some time now been a very popular practice: for example, Zelenkauskaite notes that in 2014, cross-platform viewership of television in the US included 79% of viewers interacting through a second screen as they watched a television screen, be it mobile phone, laptop, or tablet. In addition, the reasons given for using a second screen while watching television were less likely to be programme-related, and more likely, as devices of distractiond either to facilitate multitasking, serve as a distraction during commercials, or to view when the programme itself became less engaging (2016). Here, I feel, is where the importance of re-thinking the relationship between viewer and viewed, and the spaces between the social world of ritual and the psychic world of the imaginary, become crucial in the connected context. Television studies has long recognised this in principle – Skeggs and Wood, for example, pointing to television as an affective technology 'of the social that works through encouraging intensity, intimacy and belonging' (2012, p. 71). The same authors also found evidence that showed that what happens in collective viewing spaces especially around reality TV and factual programming facilitates a sense of *interconnectivity* (2012). This word – interconnectivity – is of special interest here, as it acknowledges the interdimensional axes along which the technological, social, psychological, and industrial-commercial intersect in real-world experiences, and where the ritual and the imaginative run together.

As Sherryl Wilson has pointed out, television studies research has often engaged with this intersectionality (2016). To my mind, the contradictions inherent in the televisual as a conceptual category do seem to embody the oppositional aspects driving these dimensions. Indeed, this is a sentiment borne out in post-Jungian approaches to screen

culture more generally. For instance, Hockley suggests that, in suspending seemingly opposite ideas of the commercial and the psychological in association, what one discovers is that 'it is the very sense and idea of commodity that provides the entry point into the *enantiodromaic* world of the other' (2014, p. 37 [emphasis in original]). Hockley uses the deep imagery of the Ferryman as symbolic of the psychological journey to the underworld, as simultaneously symbolic of the commercial rituals associated with the cost of admission to the cinema: 'As such, it [the box office transaction] is partly a ritualistic act, and one that gives us access to the transformative experience of the underworld' (2014, p. 37).

Hockley is primarily thinking about the act of going to the movies here, and the specific pleasures and associations found in that highly ritualistic process reminiscent of John Ellis's extra-textual aspect of cinema-going, outlined above. In Hockley's statement, what can seem at first glance a little far-fetched in terms of drawing analogy actually helps us to apprehend what is, at an allegorical level, a very useful way to engage screen culture beyond cinema. Jungian thinkers are probably quite used to the notion that a cinema screen can be thought of as a sort of allegorical container of psychic material, whether they might be persuaded of that notion or not. The interesting thing about post-cinematic modes of viewing is that they amplify what already exists in traditional media forms. So, for Hockley, just as change occurring as a result of the release of affect during psychotherapy consultation can have lasting effect, so what happens in the space between viewer and viewed stays with us beyond the duration of a screening (2014).

In connected viewing contexts, and within connected media ecologies, the character of this on-going change is a perceptible *open-ended-ness*. This is a sort of *opera aperta* of narrative work that, as a direct consequence of the technological and cultural aspects of what is known as being 'always-on' (Turkle, 2011; Boyd, 2012; Singh, 2017), means that the extended duration of narrative encounter that happens through our

engagement with linear media texts is amplified indefinitely. This imagined social space of engagement has a powerful psychological dimension because it opens up the potential for social and psychological fulfilment through persistent connectivity, and for an active media agency (engaging with content and story) in full interaction with extraordinary means for accessing information and engaging other people (social media connectivity). Connected viewing, particularly in modes of connected viewing where there are strong elements of social networking site activity, has the potential for this. And yet at the same time, in an *enantiodromaic* movement, pulls this back forcefully in collision with a contrary force – passive, event experience for what appears to resemble a mass audience, in a rather traditional mode of distracted viewing. My point here, is that connected viewing embodies both at once.

Lee and Andrejevic state that 'One of the persistent challenges of the digital era for television broadcasters has been how to make a notoriously "passive" medium interactive. [...the authors note] productivity of interactivity as a means of generating real-time data about viewers' (2014, p. 40). This seems inherently contradictory to most discourse around interactivity which sees a baseline of active, participatory viewing as an essential, almost default prerequisite to connected viewing. This challenges the fantasy of control that viewers have of process, interaction and choice in connected media environments. They go on to write that:

> While [Internet Television – on-demand streaming services] provides greater possibilities for viewers to access an abundance of content on the web and fulfils interactive television's promises of flexibility, customization, and personalization, it also collects a great amount of data generated by viewers through their browsing, search, and selection behaviors.

> (2014, p. 41).

There is logic to this contradiction that seems to feed into a counter-narrative to the assumed participatory conditions of contemporary popular culture. When put simply, a second screen can be thought of as any companion device (mobile, handheld) that people use when watching television. If the television set itself is no longer considered by the consumers themselves to be the primary interactive interface, then the television can be synchronized, through wired or Wi-Fi connectivity, to that second screen to enable real-time monitoring, customization and targeting. It is in this sense that Lee and Andrejevic (amongst others, including Braun, 2014; van Dijck, 2013) have either implied or explicitly stated that television piggy-backs onto other forms of interactivity in connected media environments, drawing from constant flow of online commentary associated with social media feeds generated through consumer interaction. However, the fundamentally linear push of the narrative sequencing here tends to simulate traditional narrative media forms, and foreground this linearity. Second-screening thus lends itself to certain kinds of 'event TV' (such as the Coronation Street Live example mentioned above, which saw a special live broadcast to mark the anniversary the longest-running soap opera in television history in 2015) where something resembling a mass audience appears to be engaging with both the textual material in real-time. At once, the real-time engagement is with the textual material *and* with one another, at the same time. Lee and Andrejevic also note that the trend to turn viewing into a 'networked social event' bucks a counter trend for on-demand and time-shifted viewing, where programming is deferred in favour of personal convenience.

There is an appetite for 'event viewing' that in some sense turns the contemporary cultural image of niche time-shifting, and the placement of control in the hands of the viewer, on its head. This conclusion, from a narrative running decidedly counter to the popular story inherited from Web 2.0 logic – that all media is interactive, and that tech-savvy consumers are active participants in a connected media ecology – rubs dramatically against the cultural image of control, choice and participation in popular

culture, and provides yet another instance of opposites in the contemporary media ecology.

References

Astruc, A. (1968) 'The birth of a new Avant-Garde: Le Caméra-Stylo', in Graham, P. (ed.), *The New Wave*. London: Secker and Warburg, pp. 17-23.

Allmer, T. (2015) *Critical theory and social media: Between emancipation and commodification*. London: Routledge.

Andrejevic, M. (2011) 'Surveillance and alienation in the online economy' in *Surveillance & Society* Vol 8 No 3, pp. 278–287.

Balick, A. (2014a) 'How to think about psychotherapy in a digital context', in Weitz, P. ed. *Psychotherapy 2.0: Where psychotherapy and technology meet*. London: Karnac.

Balick, A. (2014b) *The psychodynamics of social networking: Connected-up instantaneous culture and the Self*. London: Karnac.

Barker, J. M. (2009) *The tactile eye: Touch and the cinematic experience*. London: University of California Press.

Bassil-Morozow, H. (2010) *Tim Burton: The monster and the crowd – a Post-Jungian perspective*. Hove: Routledge.

Blake, J. (2017) *Television and the second ccreen: Interactive TV in the age of social participation*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Boyd, D. (2012) 'Participating in the always-on culture' in M. Mandiberg (ed.) *The Social Media Reader.* New York: New York University Press. pp. 71-76.

Bruns, A. (2008) *Blogs, Wikipedia, Second Life, and beyond: From production to produsage*. New York: Peter Lang.

Bordwell, D. (1985) *Narration and the fiction film*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Bordwell, D. (1996) 'Contemporary film studies and the vicissitudes of grand theory', in Bordwell, D. and N. Carroll (eds.), *Post-Theory: Reconstructing film studies*. London: University of Wisconsin Press, pp. 3-36.

Bordwell, D. (2006) *The way Hollywood tells it: Story and style in modern movies*. London: University of California Press.

Caldwell, J. T. (2004) 'The Business of New Media', in Harries, D. (ed.), *The New Media Book*. London: BFI, pp. 55-68.

Cater, N. (ed.) (2008) Technology, cyberspace, and psyche. [Special issue]. *Spring: A Journal of Archetype and Culture*, 80.

Compaine, B. M. and D. Gomery (2000) *Who owns the media? Competition and concentration in the mass media industry*. (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cunningham, S., Craig, D. and Jon Silver (2016) 'YouTube, multichannel networks and the accelerated evolution of the new screen ecology', in *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies*, Vol 22 No 4, pp. 376-391.

Ellis, J. (1992) *Visible fictions: Cinema, television, video*. (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.

Fredericksen, D (2001) 'Jung/Sign/Symbol/Film', in Hauke, C. and I. Alister (eds.), *Jung and film: Post-Jungian takes on the moving image*. Hove: Brunner-Routledge, pp. 17-55.

Fuchs, C. (2015) *Social media: A critical introduction*. London: SAGE. *Culture and economy in the age of social media*. London: Routledge.

Harries, D. (ed.) (2004) *The new media book*. London: BFI.

Hauke, C. and Ian Alister (eds.) (2000) *Jung and film: Post-Jungian takes on the moving image*. London Routledge.

Hauke, C. and Luke Hockley (eds.) (2011) *Jung and Film II –The Return: Further Post-Jungian Takes on the Moving Image*. Hove: Routledge.

Hockley, L. (2007) *Frames of mind: A Post-Jungian look at cinema, television and technology*. Bristol: Intellect.

Hockley, L. (2014) *Somatic Cinema: The relationship between body and screen – a Jungian perspective*. Hove: Routledge.

Hockley, L. and Nadi Fadina (eds.) (2015) *The happiness illusion: How the media sold us a fairytale*. Hove: Routledge.

Hockley, L. and Leslie Gardner (eds.) (2011) *House: The wounded Healer on television – Jungian and Post-Jungian reflections*. Hove: Routledge.

Holt, J., G. Steirer, and K. Petruska (2016) 'Introduction: The expanding landscape of connected viewing' in *Connected viewing*, special issue, *Convergence* vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 341-347

Izod, J. (2001) *Myth, mind and the screen: Understanding the heroes of our time*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Izod, J. (2006) *Screen, culture, psyche: A Post-Jungian approach to working with the audience*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Izod, J. and Joanna Dovalis (2015) *Cinema as therapy: Grief and transformational film*. Hove: Routledge.

Jenkins, H. (2003) 'Transmedia storytelling: Moving characters from books to films to video games can make them stronger and more compelling'. Available at: https://www.technologyreview.com/s/401760/transmedia-storytelling/ [Accessed 17/01/2017].

Jenkins, H. (2007) 'Transmedia Storytelling 101'. Available at:

http://henryjenkins.org/2007/03/transmedia_storytelling_101.html [Accessed

17/01/2017].

Jenkins, H., S. Ford, and J. Green (2013) *Spreadable media: Creating value and meaning in a networked culture*. New York: New York University Press.

Jung, C. G. (1971) *Psychological types*. CW Vol 6. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Jameson, F. (1992) *Signatures of the visible*. London: Routledge.

Keane, S. (2007) *CineTech*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.

King (2002) *New Hollywood cinema: An introduction*. London: I.B. Tauris.

Klinger, B. (2006) *Beyond the multiplex: Cinema, new technologies, and the home*. London: University of California Press, 2006.

Krüger, S. and J. Johanssen (2014) 'Alienation and digital labour – A depth-hermeneutic inquiry into online commodification and the unconscious' in *Triple C – Communication, Capitalism and Critique*, vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 632–647.

Labato, R. and J. Thomas (2015) *The informal media economy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Lashley, M. C. (2013) *Making culture on YouTube: Case studies of cultural production on the popular web platform*. Doctoral Thesis. University of Georgia.

Learmonth, M. (2013) 'Digitas unveils tool to find YouTube stars before they're stars: A long Tail of YouTube stars is out there but how to find them?' in *Advertising Age*, May 02. <http://adage.com/article/special-report-tv-upfront/digitas-unveils-tool-find-nascent-youtube-stars/241262/> [Accessed 18/07/2016].

Lee, H. J. and M. Andrejevic (2014) 'Second-screen theory', in Holt J. and K. Sanson (eds.) *Connected viewing: Selling, streaming, & sharing media in the digital era*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Lunenfeld, P. (2004) The myths of interactive cinema', in Harries, D. (ed.), *The New Media Book*. (2nd ed.). London: BFI, 2004: 144-54.

Lupton, D. (2016) *The quantified self*. Cambridge: Polity.

Marks, L. *The skin of the film: Intercultural cinema, embodiment and the senses*. London: Duke University Press, 2000.

Mehrtens, S. (2012) 'Jung on the enantiodromia: Part 1 – definitions and examples', *Jungian Center for the Spiritual Sciences: Whole Person Learning in a Jungian Context* blog. Available at: http://jungiancenter.org/jung-on-the-enantiodromia-part-1-definitions-and-examples/ [Accessed: 11/10/2016].

Ndalianis, A. (2000) 'Special effects, morphing magic, and the 1990s cinema of attractions', in Sobchack, V. (ed.), *Meta-Morphing: Visual transformation and the culture of quick change*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 251-72.

Shirky, C. (2008) *Here comes everybody: The power of organizing without organizations*. London: Penguin Press.

Singh, G. (2009) *Film after Jung: Post-Jungian approaches to film theory*. Hove: Routledge.

Singh, G. (2011) 'Cinephilia; Or, looking for meaningfulness in encounters with cinema', in Hauke and Hockley (eds.) *Jung & Film II* Hove: Routledge.

Singh, G. (2014) 'Recognition and the image of mastery as themes in *Black Mirror* (Ch4, 2011-present): an eco-Jungian approach to "always-on" culture' in *International Journal of Jungian Studies*, special issue on moving image, Vol. 6 No.2, pp. 120-132.

Singh, G. (2015) 'The myth of authentic self-actualisation: Happiness, transformation and teality TV' in Fadina, N. and Luke Hockley (eds.) *The happiness illusion: How the media sold us a fairytale*. Hove: Routledge.

Singh, G. (2017) 'YouTubers, online selves and the performance principle: Notes from a Post-Jungian perspective' in *CM: Communication and Media* Vol. 11, no. 38 pp.205–232

Singh, G. (forthcoming) *Death of Web 2.0: Ethics, connectivity and locked-in psyche in the Twenty-First century*. London: Routledge.

Skeggs, B, and H. Wood (2012) *Reacting to reality television: Performance, audience, value*. London: Routledge.

Sobchack, V. (1992) *The address of the eye: A phenomenology of film experience.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Sobchack, V. (2004) *Carnal thoughts: Embodiment and moving image culture*. London: University of California Press.

Turkle, S. (2011) *Alone together: Why we expect more from technology and less from each other*. New York: Basic Books.

Van Dijck, J. (2013) *The culture of connectivity: A critical history of social M=media*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Waddell, T. (2006) *Mis/takes: Archetype, myth and identity in screen fiction*. Hove: Routledge.

Wasko, J. (2003) *How Hollywood works*. London: Sage Publications.

Webster, J. G. (2014) *The marketplace of attention: How audiences take shape in a digital age*. London: MIT Press.

Weitz, P. (ed.) (2014) *Psychotherapy 2.0: Where psychotherapy and technology meet*. London: Karnac.

Wilson, S. (2016) 'In the Living Room: Second screens and TV audiences' in *Television & New Media* Vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 174-191.

Zelenkauskaite, A. (2016) 'Remediation, convergence, and big data: Conceptual limits of cross-platform social media' in *Convergence* Vol. 22 No 1, pp. 1-16.