Framing citizen activism: a comparative study of the CGNET Swara and Mobile Voices projects

Paromita Pain

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

MEDIA ASIA RESEARCH

Framing citizen activism: a comparative study of the CGNET Swara and Mobile Voices projects

PAROMITA PAIN

The CGNET Swara (India) and Mobile Voices (United States) demonstrate that dedicated citizen journalism outlets can effectively combine journalism and activism to mobilize communities for positive social impact. Few studies have compared citizen journalism effects in the area of mobilization across countries, in multi-cultural settings, especially in the developed and developing world. This paper compares and contrasts conceptual frames employed and approaches pursued in fundamentally different settings to examine how citizen media works for progressive change.

Keywords: citizen journalism, participatory, citizen, news consumers, news producers, multicultural environment, India, Los Angeles, framing, mobilization, communities

Introduction

In a remote corner of India, a woman is burnt alive as a witch. None of India's many television channels or newspapers highlight the tragedy. In a sunny part of California, a Mexican immigrant negotiates with authorities for a food cart license. She is desperate for she needs the money to feed her family. These are stories of people from very different parts of the world but these are both narratives, about very poor and thus powerless populations that rarely find space in mainstream media. Today, two citizens' led news sites, the CGNET Swara and the Mobile Voices (VozMob); ensure that such minority voices find an outlet. CGNET Swara and Mobile Voices also mobilize the communities they serve to take a stand and ensure that their human rights are protected.

Media scholars have extensively critiqued the democratic scarcities inherent in a corporate-dominated and commercialized media system, especially in the areas of inequalities of access, representation and political power (Carroll & Hackett. 2006). The gaps created by these inequalities are often fulfilled by alternative media, which provide the focus for both specific community interests as well as for "the contrary and subversive" (Silverstone, 1999). The growing influence of citizen journalism attests to this. Recent work amassed by Hartley (2005) illustrates how people globally translate their resistance to, or frustration with, the products of the corporate mainstream media in acts of independent, collaborative or participatory media-making**.** These media producers often have no training or professional qualifications as journalists. They write and report from their positions as citizens, members of communities and activists (Atton, 2010). Gans (2003) has underlined the importance of "multiperspectival" news that ensures a "bottom-up" approach to reporting, where information comes not just from official sources but

Paromita Pain is a Doctoral Student in the Department of Journalism at The University of Texas At Austin. Address: Belo Center for New Media, Moody College of Communication, 300 W Dean Keeton St Austin, TX 78712, USA. Email: paro@utexas.edu, paromita.pain@gmail.com

also citizens, the ordinary man on the street. Unlike traditional newspaper journalists who rely heavily on external sources, citizen journalists use more unofficial sources and opinion (Carpentier, 2009).

While the CGNET Swara (http://cgnetswara.org/) and Mobile Voices(http://vozmob.net/) focus on audience awareness and mobilization they are also personal spaces for the reporters to post pictures of families and record traditional music. Their lives and daily events often serve as sources for their reportage and in the process they serve as repositories of a community's heritage. Much of the reporter's choices of stories stem from experience, unhampered by restrictive editorial dictates. "It helps us talk freely about what we really want attention on," said one reporter of the CGNET Swara site (personal communication, 2015). "Our voices travel through communities that have faced violence, oppression and segregation," said one participant from the Mobile Voices (VozMob) site (personal communication, 2014).

The arrival and establishment of low-cost media platforms based on information and communication technologies have created a rich ecology of media falling outside state or corporate ownership and this for some societies are bringing in a new age of media activism or activist media (Frenzel et al., 2011). As studies have underlined, with the exception of some valuable case studies of citizen based media reform campaigns (McChesney, 1993; Starr, 2000), and a recent surge of work on "alternative" media as a site of potentially counter-hegemonic cultural and political practice (e.g. Carroll & Hackett 2006; Couldry & Curran, 2003; Downing, 2000), there have been relatively few efforts to theorize and compare grounds for resistance and transformation. In this light, it's worth contrasting how two dedicated citizen journalism outlets provide information and mobilize their audiences to bring about social change in two fundamentally different settings. While the communities, the CGNET Swara and Mobile Voices serve, live and work in very different countries, the situations they face are similar. They both serve resource poor and powerless communities with limited access to education and awareness. The reporters, a part of the very communities they report on are people who have in many cases never had formal schooling and use only simple mobiles phones in their work.

This study uses interviews with 15 participating journalists (five from Mobile Voices and 10 From CGNET Swara) and content analysis of the posts online and sources used to examine and contrast the narrative frames, topics and sources used by the reporters to find insights into how they mobilize their communities for social change and examine the differences in the narratives posted. Within the theoretical framework of framing theory, this study focuses on how the CGNET Swara and the Mobile Voices frame their narratives for social mobilization and their operations as alternative media structures (Marathe, O'Neill, Pain, & Thies, 2015; Opel, 2004) rather than how they influence existing media structures. While most research in the area of citizen journalism and mobilization focuses on organizations within the same country, this study, with its cross cultural aspect, addresses gaps in literature by examining and contrasting how citizen journalism and mobilization of communities occurs in two countries, from different ends of the development spectrum.

Literature review and theoretical background
Framing news narratives

Frame resonance is critical to the success with which audience mobilization happens. Snow and Benford (1988) say that frame alignment or resonance happens when the media frame is in alignment with or is relevant to the realities of the community the media serves. Snow and Benford (1988) argue that when individual frames become linked with media frames in congruency and complementariness "frame alignment" occurs. Frames tell the audience how to think about something by putting it in context (Reese, 2007). Journalistic frames do not develop in a political or cultural vacuum (Ryan, Carragee, & Meinhofer, 2001). Media frames construct a message through selection, exclusion, emphasis, and elaboration (Entman, 1993) helping identify problems, establishes causes, offer solutions and mobilize audiences (Harlow & Johnson, 2011).

Media with activist intent usually frame their stories through "master frames" (Snow & Benford, 1992), which are "action oriented sets of beliefs and meanings that inspire and legitimate social movement activities and campaigns." There are different kinds of frames the media uses to present narratives to create frame resonance. Frames are critical to inspire action (Reese, 2007). Injustice frames that assign blame and emphasize moral outrage (Gamson, 1992), frames that invoke sympathy or the sympathy frame (Wolfsfeld, 1997), frames that legitimize or de-legitimize events, fostering the public's support or marginalizing actions (Gitlin, 1980; McLeod & Hertog, 1999) and "accountability" frames that demand scrutiny of policy and government action (Boyle & Hoeschen, 2001) are some ways stories are framed so that narratives can mobilize community action.

This study approaches the news sites through the lens of framing theory because as a theory framing's value also lies in the way it bridges parts of the field that need to be in touch with each other: quantitative and qualitative, empirical and interpretive, psychological and sociological, and academic and professional (Reese, 2007). Interviews conducted with the journalists provide information regarding their motives for participation, selection of frames for narratives posted and imbues this study with qualitative elements.

Movement mobilization is shaped by news coverage but the discourses of the movement also interact with news frames to mitigate the effects of the news frames and to become the reality of that group. For groups engaged in media activism this is particularly true; especially media that serves a mostly indigent and therefore powerless audience. The poor and indigent like gender have always had stereotypical portrayals in the media. Protestors asking for their rights have often been discredited and marginalized in mainstream media with journalists relying on a "protest paradigm" that focuses on spectacles, and dramatic actions, rather than highlighting the underlying reasons for the protest (Chan & Lee, 1984; Gitlin, 1980; McLeod & Hertog, 1999). The protest paradigm (McLeod & Hertog, 1999) suggests that traditional media will negatively cover social movements,

potentially de-legitimating the movement and hurting its mobilization efforts.

In India, the media focuses on rural and issues facing the poor but they are usually done through editorials and discussion platforms where those with the largest stake in the conversation are excluded (Mudliar, Donner, & Thies, 2012). Experiences of Hispanic immigrants to the USA are largely absent from diversity literature even though immigrants are significant contributors to the diversity of the United States. Latinos, Asian Americans, or Native Americans are rarely interviewed as news sources (Poindexter, Smith, & Heider, 2003) and traditional media concentrates on low skilled, rather than skilled Hispanic immigrants (Kandel & Parrado, 2005).

Enabling the CGNET Swara and Mobile Voices in their work are Internet and mobile technologies. The Internet has become a key alternative media tool for activism (Jean Kenix, 2009; Raghavan, 2009). While it provides the primary platform for advocacy and mobilization, unlike protesters in Tunisia and Egypt, who took to online social media like Facebook and Twitter to mobilize pro-democracy social movements and start a revolution (Harlow & Johnson, 2011), the CGNET Swara and Mobile Voices approach it more journalistically, producing simple narratives voicing alternative views, building solidarity, and encouraging empowerment (Downing, 2003; Fraser, 1990; Kellner, 2000). They function in ways similar to the Ohmy-News site (http://english.ohmynews.com/) in South Korea that lets "citizens to create their own content and represent their own interests on the site, rather than having their ideas filtered through a professional journalist" (Joyce, 2007, p. 25).

Mobile phones and news

Along with the Internet, wireless technologies and mobile communications have affected the ways in which people communicate and organize their activities (Ito, Okabe, & Matsuda, 2005; Ling, 2004). The explosion of cell phone–based social networking appears to be a promising new channel, especially for narrowcasting to younger individuals and ethnic minorities (Della, Eroglu, Bernhardt, Edgerton, & Nall, 2008). Production of news in this context should

be understood in the broadest possible sense, as it refers to making media, varying from the professional production of a weekly newspaper to the offbeat exchange of comments on the website of a suburban community (Deuze, 2006). Since both the CGNET Swara and the Mobile Voices operate through simple mobile phones, they are also valid examples of how the rapid penetration of mobile phones in low-income regions of the world has triggered widespread interest in building systems and applications for the benefit of education, health, government, and other social ends (Mudliar et al., 2012).

Living in resource-poor environments is not a barrier to use of mobile technology for several cultural and economic reasons (Kaplan, 2006). The social value of a mobile phone is highly valued even in resource-poor areas. The "digital divide" along the socio-economic gradient is less pronounced in mobile phones than in other communication technologies such as the Internet (Geser, 2004). Media use and talking with others have been found to have positive effects on citizens' civic participation (Wyatt, Katz, & Kim, 2000). Likewise, expressive political participation via the Internet has been linked to mobilization in the offline realm as well (Gil de Zuniga, Puig-I-Abril, & Rojas, 2009).

Citizen media and mobilization

The concept that the citizen journalist is one who operates far from the precincts of traditional media, has little or no formal training and is usually from the community they report on and about has been established (Atton, 2009). But in today's networked world ideas of citizen-led activist media take on new implications. Broadly defined, "activism" is the actions of a group of like-minded individuals coming together to change the status quo, advocating for a cause, whether local or global (Cammaerts, 2007; Kahn & Kellner, 2004; Lomicky & Hogg, 2010). American punk rock musician and political activist Jello Biafra (real name, Eric Boucher) has celebrated citizen journalism as people who "become the media" (Downing, 2000).

"Becoming the media" is also a perspective on the media audience as active producers of meaning from within their own cultural context (Barker, 2003, p. 325). Schaffer (2007) observes that citizen journalism is emerging as a form of "bridge" media, linking traditional forms of journalism with classic civic participation. The former makes strategic use of the media (whether mainstream or its own) as a means toward some other political end; the latter approaches media as an (at least temporarily) end in itself. The two organizations under consideration here (CGNET and Mobile Voices) fall in the latter category. Both the CGNET Swara and Mobiles Voices post stories that serve as calls to action and organize protests serving as a sort of link between information and action.

CGNET Swara: "Voice for the voiceless"

Shubrashu Choudhury, a former BBC correspondent, set up the CGNet Swara in February 2010 for the people of Chhattisgarh. Chhattisgarh's living standard is among the poorest in India. The state has rich reserves of minerals but lacks basic school and health facilities. Choudhury says, "The residents of Chhattisgarh need to have a credible news source manned by journalists who know the language and culture of the land" (personal interview, February 2015).

The impetus behind CGNet Swara was to extend reach to anyone with access to a low-end mobile phone. "Journalists stationed in the region aren't from the state and often don't know the language or the nuances of culture," Choudhury said (personal interview, February 2014). Internet penetration in Chhattisgarh stands at .5%. Users of CGNet Swara place a phone call to the system, which presents them with the option of recording their news stories, and listening to other messages (Mudliar et al., 2012). Professional journalists who volunteer for the site fact check stories and post them to the website. The site has summaries of the stories in English as well as the voice files uploaded by the reporters in their local language. CGNET Swara currently logs more than 500 calls per day. Their stories have impact and as one reporter, an active women journalist, says, her reporting made her respond to her surroundings differently: "Now, I know I too have a voice."

Mobile Voices: silent no more

Mobile Voices (http://vozmob.net), started in 2008, is an academic-community partnership between the Annenberg School for Communication at the University of Southern California (http://annenberg.usc.edu/) and the Institute of Popular Education of Southern California. The collaboration consists of the research and design of a web-based platform that allows low-wage immigrants in Los Angeles to publish stories online about their lives and their communities directly from their mobile phones (Bar et al., 2009). The VozMob or Mobiles Voices project believes that while much is written about low-wage workers and immigrants in the United States, these populations don't produce media on their own. Various examples of the subjects covered by reporters contributing to Mobile Voices (VozMob) can be seen on the site. One recent report shows day laborers waiting for jobs, entertaining each other by singing. The participants are trained to post their stories and blog on the site through various workshops and encouraged to post what they see around them.

In this light the research questions this study will answer are:

RQ1: What are the major topics covered by the CGNET Swara and Mobile Voices sites and is there a significant difference between the topics covered?

Stories that demand accountability or those that are about protests against rights violations in the traditional or legacy media rarely quote the protestors (McLeod & Detenber, 1999; McLeod & Hertog, 1992). Media, in a bid to show balance, juxtapose the protesters voices against official sources often making them seem irrational (Hertog & McLeod, 1995). The CGNET and Mobile Voices are media that belong to those who are raising an alternate voice against the official line. In such a case examining their sources would help gain deeper insights into their media production parameters.

RQ2: What are the kinds of sources CGNET Swara and Mobile Voices use and is there a significant difference between the sources used in the two sites for similar stories?

RQ3: What are the major frames used by the CGNET Swara and Mobile Voices in their coverage of issues and is there a significant difference between the frames used to cover similar topics?
RQ4: How do the coverage of issues by the CGNET Swara and Mobile Voices mobilize audiences and is there a significant difference between the coverage of issues that seek to mobilize their audiences?

Reporters from the CGNET Swara and Mobile Voices aren't paid. An examination of individual citizen journalism projects show that personal motivation (Liu, Palen, Sutton, Hughes, & Vieweg, 2008) and a sense of gratification at being able to create their own media are primary driving forces, motivating citizens to create information. To understand the influences on the content, choices of issues and why the journalists of the two sites participate in the projects the study also interviews the journalists of the two projects. Their perspectives lend credence and help understand the findings of this study.

Methods

The study looks at the primary conceptual frames employed, strategic approaches and outcomes pursued by two citizen media organizations, the CGNET Swara from India and the Mobile Voices from Los Angles California, in fundamentally different settings in an attempt to understand how media created by so called powerless segments can be instrumental in organizing populations for progressive change. Articles posted on the sites (CGNET Swara and Mobile Voices) from January 2014 to December 2015 were content analyzed to isolate the frames the narratives were placed within. 10 journalists from the CGNET Swara and five journalists from the Mobile Voices were interviewed to understand their primary motives for participating and selection of narratives frames. The codebook was developed from the ones created for analyzing citizen's journalism and activism in Egypt and El Salvador (Harlow & Harp, 2012) and the Global Digital Activism Data Set (February 2013: ICPSR 34625).

The unit of analysis was each story or post that fell within this time period. For the Mobile Voices

site, all the articles were considered. For the CGNET Swara articles in the tribal languages of Kurukh or Gondi were not considered because the coders aren't familiar with these languages. Since a majority of the stories were in Hindi eliminating the other language still allows an examination of most of the stories. 35 stories in the tribal language Gondi and 20 in Kurukh were eliminated, as the author didn't know Gondi. All stories from the CGNET Swara within the selected time period amounted to 971 stories and posts. In total 150 stories and posts from the Mobile Voices were found. Since the number of stories significantly varied in terms of numbers a random sampling of the stories from the CGNET Swara were compared for frames and topics with all the stories from the Mobile Voices. The RANDBETWEEN Function was used on the Excel data sheet to generate the selection of stories from the CGNET Swara site. A total of 150 stories from the CGNET Swara and 150 stories from the Mobile Voices were then coded to answer the research questions. Thus a desired sample size of $N = 300$ (Krippendorff 2004, Neuendorf 2002) was used for the study. An alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests. The study uses Tankard's (2001) list of frames approach to classify the frames in a post.

RQ1 asked about the topics most frequently covered by the two news outlets and the significant differences between topics used by the two projects was coded to analyze the most recurring topics. To characterize the content on CGNet Swara and Mobile Voices, detailed coding of the frequently recurring topics was done looking for subjects that dealt with issues of nationality or rights as citizens, economy, health, immigration, human rights and environmental issues. The issue of migration was coded through issues on immigration, migrant issues, leaving home to work elsewhere or leaving ones homeland for another county. Stories in the human rights category were coded for women's issues, rights, and opportunities for self-improvement, campaigns, demonstrations, and activist related work. Stories about the economy were classified contingent on them being dealing with issues of jobs, employment schemes, economic parameters like poverty level indicators, below poverty line families, references to salaries and

other employment related matters. A random sample of 30 stories from both the sites showed these recurring topics hence the study used these broad themes to code for the frequent topics. Crosstab functions analyzed if there was a significant difference between the topics the two sites covered.

RQ2 dealt with the kind of sources used. All humans quoted in the story were counted. All sources were considered official if they had government connections. Sources who were professionals (laborers, farmers, all those without links to official government bodies) were considered unofficial or citizen voices (Harlow & Johnson, 2011). Crosstab functions analyzed if there was a significant difference between the sources the two sites used.

To analyze RQ3, which examined the frames CGNET Swara and Mobile Voices use and the significant differences, this study depended on nominal variables that coded for the use of: (a) Injustice frames: defined as emphasizing moral outrage, the significance of a problem and injustices being done; (b) Sympathy frames: defined as provoking support, compassion, or sympathy for the people portrayed as underdogs; (c) Legitimizing frames: defined as recognition or support of the clams of the people in the post, fostering the public's support for the protesters, or portraying them as having a real, legitimate reason to protest. (d) Accountability frames, defined as suggesting there is a consensus that an issue is wrong and in need of changes or oversight/monitoring; and (e) Contextual frames, defined as in-depth history and background (Boyle & Hoeschen, 2001; Gamson, 1992; Harlow & Johnson, 2011; McLeod & Hertog, 1999; Wolfsfeld, 1997). An example of an injustice frame would be a story filed on the lack of schoolteachers in the local government school by the CGNET Swara. An example of the sympathy frame would be the story on how a fruit vendor's cart was confiscated by the police leading to her loosing her earnings and her family mussing dinner. The contextual frame would include stories like the ones on CGNET Swara that covered issues of wages and government policies while explaining why they were necessary. Crosstab functions analyzed if there was a significant difference between the frames the two sites used.

Table 1
Major frames used in the coverage of issues

	CGNET Swara (%)	Mobile Voices (%)
Injustice	73.9***	37.5***
Sympathy	40.3	22.9
History or context	61.3**	33.3**
Legitimacy	27.7	25.0
Accountability	21.0*	2.1*

***Significant differences in the way the sites used the frames (χ^2 = 19.6, df = 1, p < .001).
**Significant differences in the way the sites used the frames (χ^2 = 10.78, df = 1, p = .001).
*Significant differences in the way the sites used the frames (χ^2 = 9.319, df = 1, p > .001).

Table 2
Percentage of stories devoted to common topics

	CGNET Swara (%)	Mobile Voices (%)
Human rights	81.5***	60.4***
Nation	1.7**	22.9**
Health	11.8	22.9
Economy	34.5	29.2
Migration	0*	41.7*
Environment	3.4	0

***Significant differences in the way the sites used the frames (χ^2 = 8.218, df = 1, p > .001).
**Significant differences in the way the sites used the frames (χ^2 = 21.487, df = 1, p < .001).
*Significant differences in the way the sites used the frames (χ^2 = 56.32, df = 1, p < .001).

To measure RQ4 (How do the coverage of issues by the CGNET Swara and Mobile Voices mobilize audiences and what were the differences between the two sites?) all the articles were analyzed for their activist character by measuring the frequency with which the narratives informed about an upcoming protest, described experiences at protests, showed solidarity with causes, called for investigation into issues and demanded justice in general (Harlow & Harp, 2012). Crosstabs showed the difference between the two site's uses of these topics to mobilize audiences.

Interviews with the reporters from both agencies were interviewed to understand story selection criteria, selection of sources and other possible influences on their editorial process through questions like "why they participate in spite of no payment," "what motivates them to post stories," "why do they select the stories the do" and "how do they view their twin roles of journalism and activism". The respondent names were kept confidential. The answers are used in the discussion section to lend context to the analysis.

Inter-coder reliability

The author of this study trained a senior graduate student with no knowledge of citizen journalism news to assist in coding. To establish inter-coder reliability, the author and the coding assistant coded a total of 50 stories from CGNET Swara and 20 stories from the Mobile Voices site. Inter-coder reliability was 98%, calculated as the ratio of number of decisions agreed upon by both coders and the total number of decisions taken by them (Poindexter & McCombs, 2000). Inter-coder reliability for individual variables showed a Kappa range from .61 to 1, with an overall mean of .85, exceeding the acceptable minimum standard (Poindexter & McCombs, 2000). The interviews of the participants were analyzed qualitatively in conjunction with the content analysis.

Table 3
Difference between coverage of issues for mobilization

	CGNET Swara (%)	Mobile Voices (%)
Informing about an upcoming protest	58.3	41.7
Describing experience at a protest	61.5	38.5
Solidarity with cause	82.4	17.6
Call for investigation into issues	86.4	13.6
Demand for justice in general	65.5	34.5

Note: $\chi^2 = 8.298$, df = 5, $p > .001$.

Table 4
Sources

	CGNET Swara	Mobile Voices
Non official sources	100%	80% (non official sources)

Note: $\chi^2 = 23.50$, df = 1, $p < .001$.

Results

In answer to RQ1 (Table 1), which asked which major frames were employed in the coverage of issues, analysis shows that injustice frames that highlighted injustices were used 37.5% of the time by the Mobile Voices and 73.9% of the time by the CGNET Swara. Sympathy frames that evoked sympathy or support for the protesters were employed 40% of the time by the CGNET Swara and 22.9% of the time by Mobile Voices. Stories coded as having legitimizing frames that gave credit to the protesters' grievances showed that the CGNET Swara used it 27.7% of the time, and the Mobile Voices used it 25% of the time. Accountability frames that suggested there was a consensus that an issue was wrong and in need of rectification was used 21% of the time by the CGNET Swara and 2.1% by the Mobile Voices. 61% of the stories on the CGNET Swara used the history or in-depth context frame while 33% of the stories on Mobile Voices used this frame. The dominant frame in both the CGNET stories and Mobile Voices was the injustice frame followed by the history or context frame. The injustice frame dominated the stories of the CGNET Swara and the Mobile Voices. The accountability frame was used the least by both the sites.

Some of the narratives had overlapping frames. For example: 20% of the stories on the Mobile Voices had overlapping frames. For example the sympathy frame was found in stories on injustice. For example the report on the woman's fruit cart that was confiscated talked about the injustice meted out while also invoking sympathy for her family now left without a source of income.

The chi-square analysis showed that between the two sites there was significant difference in the way the frames injustice (Asymp. Sig. .000), contextual (Asymp. Sig. .001) and accountability (Asymp. Sig. .002) are used. The Asymp. Sig being less than .05 show the statistic is considered to be significant (we can be 95% confident that the relationship between the two variables is not due to chance). There was no significant difference between the ways the sites used the sympathy (Asymp. Sig. .2) and legitimizing frames (Asymp. Sig. .1).

In answer to RQ2, which asked about the major topics covered by the CGNET Swara and Mobile Voices sites, the analysis showed that human rights were the most covered topic for both the sites. 81.5% of the stories on the CGNET Swara were about or related to human rights while Mobile Voices had 60.4% of the coded stories on the topic. The CGNET Swara devoted 34.5% of its stories to the economy while the Mobile Voices had 29.2% of the coded stories on the topic.

On the migration issue, the study found the CGNET Swara devoting no stories to the topic while

41.7% of the Mobile Voices stories were on this. Environment was the least popular topic with the Mobile Voices having no stories among the coded narratives and only 3.4% of CGNET Swara's narratives devoted to it. While human rights formed the bulk of the stories, environment was the least popular topic.

Table 2 shows the percentages of stories for each topic.

The chi square analysis showed significant difference between the ways the two sites covered common topics. The differences were most significant where the topics of migration, human rights and stories that focused on issues of nationality. The Asymp. Sig. between the sites where migration was concerned was .000. The Asymp. Sig. between the sites where human rights was concerned was .004. The Asymp. Sig. between the sites where stories focused on nation was concerned was .000. There was little significant difference among the topics economy (Asymp. Sig. .511), health (Asymp. Sig. .068) and environment (Asymp. Sig. .119). While human rights formed a significant number of the stories, the CGNET Swara had significantly a larger number of stories devoted to the topic.

For RQ3 that asks how the coverage of issues by the CGNET Swara does and Mobile Voices mobilize their audiences and is there a significant difference between the coverage of issues for mobilization between the two sites, the analysis showed no significant variation between the way the two sites used their narratives to mobilize their audiences (see Table 3). The Chi Square revealed an Asymp. Sig of 5 that shows that the variation in the way the sites mobilize their audiences is not significant. While the CGNET Swara used about 86% of the stories to call for investigation into issues, the Mobile Voices used their narratives to inform about upcoming protests.

For RQ4, which is about the kind of sources the reporters use, this study found that the CGNET Swara used 100% of unofficial sources while the Mobile Voices used 80% of unofficial sources (see Table 4).

As the analysis for RQ4 revealed, that asked is there a significant difference between the sources used in the two sites for similar stories, shows an Asymp. Sig of .000 which is a significant difference between the sources used in the two sites for similar

stories. The stories were coded for two kinds of sources, official and non-official. For the CGNET Swara and the Mobile Voices the non-official sources play a very active role being quoted over official sources and being the main spokespersons for the narratives. Non-official sources took on active roles of commentators and analysts in the posted narratives.

Discussion

Focusing on a content analysis of narratives within a six months period (January 2014 to December 2015) posted on the two citizen media sites the CGNET Swara from India and the Mobile Voices (VozMob) from Los Angeles this study demonstrates that two media outlets led by citizens untrained in the profession of journalism working in two diametrically opposite development spectrums can use frames topics and sources to mobilize and empower their audiences with significant differences and surprising similarities They are not media outlets working to reform mainstream media but media that is raising an alternative voice talking about those who fall outside the pale of mainstream media As Hartley (2005) illustrated these two sites are examples of how people globally translate their resistance to products of the corporate mainstream media by creating independent collaborative or participatory media on their own Journalists from the CGNET Swara and Mobile Voices have little professional training They produce media from their positions as citizens members of communities and activists (Atton 2010) Since their activism is community based, their activism is local in nature As one participant from the Mobile Voices project said, "We would like to create impact at the national level but before that we would like to engage the community with the issue" (personal communication, 2014).

Even though their work is locally situated, there are crucial differences in the way they frame their stories. Much of this, perhaps, has to do with the fact that while the CGNET Swara might report on resource poor people the community is sure of their status as citizens. While they may not be able to define ideas of nationhood, their focus on issues is undiluted by questions of belonging. In fact, many of the stories are focused on how the people of the land are being

ignored by the government and officials and that is unjust. The Mobile Voices working for poor migrant labors works with a community whose ideas of citizenship is contested.

The CGNET Swara often uses the protestors themselves as sources and features stories purely from their perspective. Mobile Voices focuses on individual experiences of undocumented immigrant workers. In order to understand and appreciate the contestations and claims that many undocumented immigrants make on a daily level in LA to survive and support their families, it becomes significant to recognize the city's policies towards them (Bhimji, 2014). Mobile Voices is vital in increasing this understanding. The links between urban citizenship and undocumented immigrants tends to be more complex than between migrants with legal rights (Bhimji, 2014). This is a crucial area of difference where the kinds of audiences the two networks serve are concerned. In India, CGNET Swara works in remote areas where accessing health and education is a challenge but no one questions the citizenship of the population.

"Becoming the media" is also a perspective on the media audience as active producers of meaning from within their own cultural context (Barker, 2003, p. 325). One post on the Mobile Voices site is a poignant appeal for those who crossed the border as children: "The undocumented DREAMers on this side were not touched by border patrol, but what about all the ones looking and chanting through the small holes in the fence? Those are only some of the DREAMers that Obama failed." Examples like Mobile Voices provide communities spaces to ask questions relating to rights. Understanding the news creation and activism aspect is important because both are integral to the work that these organized citizen journalism media outlets do. A post on the Mobile Voices site regarding the racial profiling of immigrant families in Arizona linked to an organized protest where audiences can participate.

Both the Mobile Voices and the CGNET have links to where audiences can participate in civil marches or protests. The Mobile Voices and the contrasts in this area with the CGNET Swara underline the importance of citizenship and the influence of

strong national identities. As one participant from the CGNET Swara said, "Those in power should be held accountable" (personal communication, 2014). This perhaps accounts most significantly for the differences between the injustice (the most common frame), the contextual and the accountability frames while there were no significant differences between the sympathy and legitimizing frames. 73.9% of the stories on the CGNET and 37. 5% of the stories on the Mobile Voices site used the injustice frame followed by the sympathy and context frames. But there is a disparity in the way the two sites use the injustice frame. While the Mobile Voices frames the injustice issues through simple questions (for example in a story on the Mexican consulate, the reporter asks "The Consulate exists to provide a service to Mexican nationals that are already living in difficult conditions in a country that does not seem to want or accept them. Why is the Consulate seemingly adopting that same attitude?" The CGNET Swara is outright in its demands that an injustice has happened, as for example, in a story that talks about how people whose homes were destroyed by wild elephant attacks aren't receiving any help.

Their areas of similarity are surprising. They might operate in different countries but the topics they cover are similar. Human rights (CGNET Swara 82% and mobile Voices 60%) formed the bulk of the topics most commonly covered by both the sites followed by narratives on economy. Human rights abuses shouldn't be the hallmark of a developed economy in which the Mobile Voices operate but as the coverage shows like the CGNET Swara, which works in very resource poor areas, the issues they face are similar in character. On both the sites, the majority of stories highlights injustices and asks for an investigation into issues.

An interesting aspect is that while the CGNET Swara (0%) had few stories on migrant related issues the Mobile Voices devoted 42% of the narratives to his issue. But this isn't surprising. Being migrant and without defined rights is an issue that defines the community that Mobile Voices serves. While CGNET's audience too is poor and powerless, they are more in the danger of losing what they are sure that belongs to them (for example: land, employment rights, right to

fair wages) whereas the migrant experience of leaving familiar surroundings and moving to unknown places for work is a dominant theme in the Mobile Voices stories since this site caters to undocumented workers and migrants. Their focus is to give space to issues of immediate concern to the community and mobilize their audience for change. In this sense the sites aren't working to change the way traditional media works rather their aim is to work effectively as alternative media structures (Opel, 2004) rather than influence existing media structures. The narratives posted inform about upcoming protests, describe experiences at protests, ask to show solidarity with causes, and call for justice in general.

Both sites commonly ask to show solidarity with cause's more than even demanding justice in general. As one participant from the CGNET site said, "Those in power cause the problems. There is no use asking them for justice. But if we as a whole understand the injustice that's when things will change." An interesting aspect is that while the sites mobilize audiences in similar ways, the frames they use for their stories are significantly different especially where the injustice (Asymp Sig. .000), contextual (Asymp Sig. .001) and accountability frames (Asymp Sig. .002) were concerned, the differences were stark.

The sources most often used are non-official sources. The CGNET Swara uses non-official sources 96% of the time. This use of non-official sources leads to a clear provision of alternate views in both the sites. The poor, the indigent and protestors asking for their rights have often been discredited and marginalized in mainstream media (Chan & Lee, 1984; Gitlin, 1980; McLeod & Hertog, 1999) but here in contrast to mainstream media the posts emphasized the injustices being committed and ensured that the protesters were shown in a positive light with validation for their actions. While the CGNET focuses on using protestors and local people the Mobile Voices uses a lot more personal opinion and experience in their reportage. This perhaps accounts for the significant difference (Asymp. Sig. of .000) among their use of sources.

Mobile Voices usually situates the story through personal experience. As one post on the site about the

unfair car towing practices states (http://vozmob.net/en/story/free-our-cars-campaign-launch): "I need to drive my children to school! I need to drive to work! I need to survive!" Unlike any other US metropolitan city, driving a car and possession of a California driving license signifies membership, inclusion and citizenship to LA. By situating the narrative within the realm of experience these sites act as spaces for protesters' voices and perspectives, and also as participatory, interactive approach to news coverage that could prompt greater credibility among readers.

It is in the area of mobilizing their audiences to fight against social injustices that these two sites develop a common communication identity. (The differences are in the frames not here in the way mobilization happens. The Chi Square revealed an Asymp. Sig of 5 which shows that the variation in the way the sites mobilize their audiences is not significant.) It's important to point out that both use frames to help identify problems, establish causes, offer solutions and mobilize audiences (Harlow & Johnson, 2011). There are no significant differences between the ways the two sites mobilize their audiences. Mobile Voices has links to where audiences can information to join protests register their views about issues. The CGNET Swara has dates and places requesting audiences to participate. Both put in context and give a background to the stories, which work well to explain to their audience the whole situation and why a protest needs to be registered. The call for action is either reflected in wanting an investigation into issues or calling for audiences to call in to build pressure. The CGNET Swara announces the numbers of the officials they want the public to call and ask for justice. In their attempts to bring in individuals to change the status quo, advocate for a cause, whether local or global, they take on the role of activists (Cammaerts, 2007; Kahn & Kellner, 2004; Lomicky & Hogg, 2010). It is here they act as bridges between journalism and classic civic participation (Schaffer, 2007). Their call for participation is also a way to engage their audiences' offline as well ensuring that political participation online is linked to mobilization in the offline realm as well (Gil de Zunigaet al., 2009). Civic participation is encouraged through requests to the audience to attend

protests or all official asking for justice. For example a post on CGNET Swara talking about how local people have been cheated out of jobs give a date and time for protest March, asking more people to join in.

Their use of technology is also appropriate to their resource poor contexts. A mobile phone is highly valued even in resource-poor areas (Kaplan, 2006) and the "digital divide" is less pronounced (Geser, 2004). While the CGNET Swara and Mobile Voices use the internet as an alternative media tool for activism (Jean Kenix, 2009; Raghavan, 2009), their primary focus is advocacy and mobilization through journalism unlike the way recent protest movements like those in Tunisia and Egypt (Harlow & Johnson, 2011) have utilized social media. Most of CGNET Swara's reporters are part of the protests themselves and these two sites have "emerged as a counter public space for voicing alternative views" (Downing, 2003; Fraser, 1990; Kellner, 2000) much like the OhmyNews site in South Korea.

This analysis extends our understanding of how dedicated citizen journalism projects, characterized by strong participatory and dialogical elements, in two radically different settings, operate from the media production as well as a participation point of view to engage and create a more socially conscious and socially active citizenry. For projects of this kind, finance and sustainability is always an issue. While the CGNET is funded by philanthropies, the VozMob is dependent on funding from university and social organization partnerships.

While the study studies citizen journalism effectiveness in two fundamentally different countries, the study doesn't examine how such journalism can actually affect traditional media agendas to make them more sensitive to the issues faced by marginalized populations. Since the study focuses on two specific organizations, we can't generalize the results beyond them. The sample of journalists interviewed was small. Also since both the sites are works in progress, it will be important to see how they develop as news products in a few years. Future research can focus on their effectiveness as social mobilisers online and offline when they have had more time to develop their identities as activist citizen media further.

References

Atton, C. (2009). Alternative and citizen journalism. In K. Wahl-Jorgensen & T. Hanitzsch (Eds.), *The handbook of journalism studies* (pp. 265–278). New York, NY: Routledge.

Atton, C. (2010). Popular music fanzines: Genre, aesthetics, and the "democratic conversation". *Popular Music and Society, 33*, 517–531.

Bar, F., Brough, M., Costanza-Chock, S., Gonzalez, C., Wallis, C. J., & Garces, A. (2009, May). Mobile voices: A mobile, open source, popular communication platform for first-generation immigrants in Los Angeles. Unpublished paper presented at the *Preconference workshop at the International Communication Association (ICA) Conference*. Retrieved from http://idepsca.org

Barker, C. (2003). *Cultural studies: Theory and practice* (p. 325). London: Sage.

Bhimji, F. (2014). Undocumented immigrants' performances and claims of urban citizenship in Los Angeles. *Journal of Intercultural Studies, 35*, 18–33.

Boyle, E. H., & Hoeschen, A. (2001). Theorizing the form of media coverage over time. *The Sociological Quarterly, 42*, 511–527.

Cammaerts, B. (2007). Jamming the political: Beyond counter-hegemonic practices. *Continuum, 21*, 71–90.

Carpentier, N. (2009). Participation is not enough: The conditions of possibility of mediated participatory practices. *European Journal of Communication, 24*, 407–420.

Carroll, W. K., & Hackett, R. A. (2006). Democratic media activism through the lens of social movement theory Media. *Culture & Society, 28*, 83–104.

Chan, J. M., & Lee, C. C. (1984). The journalistic paradigm on civil protests: A case study of Hong Kong. In A. Aron & W. Dissanayake (Eds.), *The news media in national and international conflict* (pp. 183–202). Boulder, CO: Westview.

Couldry, N., & Curran, J. (Eds.). (2003). *Contesting media power: Alternative media in a networked world*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Della, L. J., Eroglu, D., Bernhardt, J. M., Edgerton, E., & Nall, J. (2008). Looking to the future of new media in health marketing: Deriving propositions based on traditional theories. *Health Marketing Quarterly, 25*, 147–174.

Deuze, M. (2006). Participation, remediation, bricolage: Considering principal components of a digital culture. *The Information Society, 22*, 63–75.

Downing, J. D. (2000). *Radical media: Rebellious communication and social movements*. Chicago, IL: Sage.

Downing, J. D. (2003). Audiences and readers of alternative media: The absent lure of the virtually unknown. *Media, Culture & Society, 25*, 625–645.

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication, 43*, 51–58.

Fraser, N. (1990). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. *Social Text,* (25/26), 56–80.

Frenzel, F., Böhm, S., Quinton, P., Spicer, A., Sullivan, S., & Young, Z. (2011). Alternative media in north and south-a comparison: The cases of IFIWatchnet and Indymedia in Africa. *Environment and Planning A, 43*, 1173–1189.

Gamson, W. A. (1992). *Talking politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gans, H. J. (2003). *Democracy and the news*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Geser, H. (2004). Towards a sociological theory of the mobile phone. In A. Zerdick, A. Picot, K. Schrape, J.-C. Burgelmann, R. Siverstone, V. Feldmann, … C. Wolff (Eds.), *E-Merging media: Communication and the media economy of the future* (pp. 235–260). Berlin: Springer.

Gil de Zuniga, H., Puig-I-Abril, E., & Rojas, H. (2009). Weblogs, traditional sources online and political participation: An assessment of how the internet is changing the political environment. *New Media & Society, 11*, 553–574.

Gitlin, T. (1980). *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making & unmaking of the new left*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Harlow, S., & Harp, D. (2012). Collective action on the web. *Information, Communication & Society, 15*, 196–216.

Harlow, S., & Johnson, T. J. (2011). The Arab spring| overthrowing the protest paradigm? How The New York Times, global voices and twitter covered the Egyptian revolution. *International journal of Communication, 5*, 16.

Hartley, John. (Ed.). (2005). *Creative industries*. London: Blackwell.

Hertog, J. K., & McLeod, D. M. (1995). Anarchists wreak havoc in downtown Minneapolis: A multi-level study of media coverage of radical protest. *Journalism & Mass Communication Monographs,* (151), 1.

Ito, M., Okabe, D., & Matsuda, M. (2005). *Personal, portable, pedestrian: Mobile phones in Japanese life*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press

Jean Kenix, L. (2009). Blogs as alternative. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 14*, 790–822.

Joyce, M. (2007). *The citizen journalism web site "OhmyNews" and the 2002 South Korean presidential election* (pp. 25–27). Cambridge, MA: Berkman Center for Internet & Society, Harvard University.

Kahn, R., & Kellner, D. (2004). New media and internet activism: From the "Battle of Seattle" to blogging. *New Media & Society, 6*, 87–95.

Kandel, W., & Parrado, E. A. (2005). Restructuring of the US meat processing industry and new Hispanic migrant destinations. *Population and Development Review, 31*, 447–471.

Kaplan, W. A. (2006). Can the ubiquitous power of mobile phones be used to improve health outcomes in developing countries? *Globalization and Health, 2*, 9.

Kellner, D. (2000). New technologies/new literacies: Reconstructing education for the new millennium. *Teaching Education, 11*, 245–265.

Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ling, R. (2004). *The mobile connection: The cell phone's impact on society*. Burlington, MA: Morgan Kaufmann.

Liu, S. B., Palen, L., Sutton, J., Hughes, A. L., & Vieweg, S. (2008). In search of the bigger picture: The emergent role of on-line photo sharing in times of disaster. In *Proceedings of the information systems for crisis response and management conference (ISCRAM)*. Washington, DC, USA.

Lomicky, C. S., & Hogg, N. M. (2010). Computer-mediated communication and protest. *Information, Communication & Society, 13*, 674–695.

Marathe, M., O'Neill, J., Pain, P., & Thies, W. (2015, May). Revisiting CGNet Swara and its impact in rural India. In *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Information and Communication Technologies and Development* (p. 21). Singapore: ACM.

McChesney, F. S. (1993). Boxed in: Economists and benefits from crime. *International Review of Law and Economics, 13*, 225–231.

McLeod, D. M., & Hertog, J. K. (1992). The manufacture of public opinion by reporters: informal cues for public perceptions of protest groups. *Discourse & Society, 3*, 259–275.

McLeod, D. M., & Detenber, B. H. (1999). Framing effects of television news coverage of social protest. *Journal of Communication, 49*, 3–23.

McLeod, D. M., & Hertog, J. K. (1999). Social control, social change and the mass media's role in the regulation of protest groups. In D. Demers & K. Viswanath (Eds.), *Mass media, social control, and social change: A macrosocial perspective* (pp. 305–330). Ames, IA: Iowa State University.

Mudliar, P., Donner, J., & Thies, W. (2012, March). Emergent practices around CGNet Swara, voice forum for citizen journalism in rural India. In *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Information and Communication Technologies and Development* (pp. 159–168). Atlanta, GA: ACM.

Neuendorf, K. (2002). *The content analysis guidebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Opel, A. (2004). *Micro radio and the FCC: Media activism and the struggle over broadcast policy*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Poindexter, P. M., & McCombs, M. E. (2000). *Research in mass communication: A practical guide*. Boston, MA: Bedford St. Martin's.

Poindexter, P. M., Smith, L., & Heider, D. (2003). Race and ethnicity in local television news: Framing, story assignments, and source selections. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 47*, 524–536.

Raghavan, R. (2009). *Digital activism on YouTube. The Official Google Blog*. Retrieved from http://googleblog.blogspot.com/2009/07/digital-activism-on-youtube.html

Reese, S. D. (2007). The framing project: A bridging model for media research revisited. *Journal of Communication, 57*, 148–154.

Ryan, C., Carragee, K. M., & Meinhofer, W. (2001). Theory into practice: Framing, the news media, and collective action. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 45*, 175–182.

Schaffer, J. (2007). *Citizen media: Fad or the future of news? The rise and prospects of hyperlocal journalism*. Reston, VA: API Media Center.

Silverstone, R. (1999). *Why study the media?* (p. 103). London: Sage.

Snow, D. A., & Benford, R. D. (1988). Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization. *International Social Movement Research, 1*, 197–217.

Snow, D. A., & Benford, R. D. (1992). Master frames and cycles of protest. In A. D. Morris & C. McClurg-Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in social movement theory* (pp. 133–155). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Starr, A. (2000). *Naming the enemy: Anti-corporate social movements confront globalization*. London: Zed Books.

Tankard, J. W. (2001). The empirical approach to the study of media framing. In S. D. Reese, O. H. Gandy, & A. E. Grant (Eds.), *Framing public life: Perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world* (pp. 95–106). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Wolfsfeld, G. (1997). *Media and political conflict: News from the Middle East*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wyatt, R. O., Katz, E., & Kim, J. (2000). Bridging the spheres: Political and personal conversation in public and private spaces. *Journal of Communication, 50*, 71–92.