Framing Theory in the Age of Social Media

M. Salih GÜRAN* ⓘD
Hüseyin ÖZARSLAN** ⓘD

ABSTRACT

The Internet age has converged various traditional mainstream media institutions as well alternative media platforms together into a hybrid media system with the New Media system that includes alternative media like social media, in particular Twitter and Facebook. Framing Theory and frame analysis has been found functional and suitable for researching complex social media communications and also the interplay of the social media with mainstream traditional media. We reviewed the literature of framing analysis in relation to social media, virtual communities and social movements to present a brief overview of the practical and theoretical potentials of frame analysis and also the particularities and problems that arose in regard to the dynamic nature of social media. As a result, frame analysis presents an even broader potential for the research of dynamic communication processes in the fast lives of virtual communities and the vast effects of online interaction of social, political, commercial institutions.

Keywords: Frame Analysis, Social Media, Mass Media, Virtual Communities.

Sosyal Medya Çağında Çerçeveleme Teorisi

ÖZ

Geleneksel medyanın büyük ölçüde internet ortamına taşınmasıyla birlikte, sosyal medyanın farklı platformlarının (özellikle Twitter ve Facebook olmak üzere) farklı özellikleriyle birlikte hibrit/melez bir medya sistemi oluşturmuştur. Çerçeveleme Teorisi ve çerçeve analizi, kitle iletişim araştırmalarındaki işlevselliğini ve yaygınlığını yeni medya çağında geliştirmeye devam etmektedir. Özellikle Twitter ve Facebook'un yeni medya sisteminin bütünleştirici iletişim ekseni olarak kullanılması çerçeveleme mekanizmalarının aktif olarak kullanılmasını yaygınlaştırmıştır. Çerçeveleme ve sosyal medya literatüründeki güncel tartışmaları inceleyen çalışmamız, hem sosyal medyanın sahip olduğu farklı çerçeveleme dinamiklerine dikkat çekmekte, hem de kitlesel iletişimin, kişiler arası iletişimden kazandığı bazı özellikleri de kullanarak sanal toplulukların hızlı oluşum ve etkileşim (tartışma) süreçlerinde nasıl kullanıldığına dikkat çekmektedir. Bu nedenle, gerek toplumsal hareketlerin, gerekse siyasal ve toplumsal iletişim süreçlerinin incelenmesinde çerçeve analizi eskisinden daha büyük bir potansiyel sunmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çerçeve Analizi, Sosyal Medya, Kitle İletişim, Sanal Topluluklar

Introduction

While the concept of socially-culturally cultivated psychological schemata for the judgement of social interactions has roots in psychology as early as by Piaget (1952) and Barttlett (1932) who found that individuals' schemata and stereotypes influenced the interpretation of novel "schema-foreign" information. Psychological frames have been introduced as more applicable and precise procedures by Bateson in 1972 as "a spatial and temporal bounding of a set of interactive messages" (p. 191), as a kind of *metacommunication,* which directed the participants' understanding of their social interaction by current roles and rules. Thus, frames also possessed the power of the choice for inclusion and exclusion of certain aspects of the relationship in the interaction. Symbolic interactionist sociologist Erwing Goffman systematized the concept of framing and frames into a constructionist theory in his book "Framing Theory" (1974) defining frames as "schemata of interpretation" that enable the individual "to locate, perceive, identify, and label" events and situations in their social world (p. 21) and thus give meaning to them for possible action. Entman, (1993) defined *individual frames* as "mentally stored clusters of ideas that guide individuals' processing of information" (Entman, 1993, p. 53) that he makes into a reference frame of long-term political views and short-term issue frames.

Gamson and Modigliani (1987) in their research of social movements developed a concept of media frames as "a central organizing idea or story line that provides meaning to an unfolding strip of events . . . The frame suggests what the controversy is about, the essence of the issue" (p. 143)." Tuchman (1978) adds to this that this framing by the media is an essential feature of news (p. 193). Gitlin (1980) asserts

that media frames serve also as working routines for journalists to quick classifying and packaging events into audience relatable news stories. Ingrained to aspiring journalists during formal and informal training and thus, these partially automatized routines can more or less be unconsciously affect news production (Gamson, 1989). Tuchman (1978) attributed to news workers the role of builders of social reality for audiences by framing. Gitlin (1980) also described news workers as "symbol handlers" who selected from amongst dominant social frames to shape events into news. Kahneman and Tversky (1984) showed in their famous experiment that during a definition of a reality, frames were emphasizing some aspects of it by selecting these while so effectively suppressing other aspects. Snow and Benford (1988) observed that social activists defined issues and problems by "diagnostic frames" that blamed actors, proposed strategies for remedy by "solution frames", and called to action by "collective action frames". Entman (1993) further systematized the dynamics of media frames by putting more emphasis on the issue of selection and salience which came to include the essentials of *Agenda Setting* theory: "To frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation". The theoretical fundaments of Framing Theory has never ceased to be subject to debates, as Entman (1993) called for a review of the "fragmented paradigm", this should be seen as a direct result of its popularity as a research paradigm and also providing easy to use and understandable discourse analysis method. From 2007 on, authors began to deemphasize theoretical discussions as a sign of the consolidation of the paradigm and as recognition of its scientific autonomy, the virtually endless empirical applicability, and a sustained interest in increasing research precision and quality (Saperas and Carrasco-Campos, 2015). *The Journal of Communication* (Scheufele ve Tewksbury, 2007) has issued *The Framing Theory Special Issue,* the paradigm has become the most frequent referred and applied media theory of the early 21st century (Borah, 2011). From 2015 on, the social networks with their inherent features have been integrated as a main field of study with increasing internationalization of perspectives (Knüpfer and Entman, 2018).

The traditional mainstream media, presumed as the lawful, regulated, communication institution of the public sphere of the mass society and the main condition for a functioning democracy, has been under continuous critic since its historical beginnings. The criticism included all social parties and also included all possible aspects of the promised functions of the implicit mission declaration of the media. The main reason for this is that the promises proved an impossible mission to achieve because the shortcomings of any media lay bare the shortcomings of the society whose public communication the media represents by culture, institutional foundations and the regulation of future change, etc. Ultimately, the institutionalized media was designed to work in those controlled tracks. It was deemed as functional as the media helped to reproduce the vision and perception patterns of the government actors -down to the teacher- onto the middle and lower classes (Carragee and Roefs, 2004). On the other hand, the alternative media(s) are marginalised to accept partisan opposition or extremism that deprives them of the single most important influence of the media -the claim of representing any part of the public opinion. The more or less dysfunctional aspects of the media has been addressed by scholars and politicians, but between conformity and polarisation, aren't the problems rooted ultimately in the culturally ingrained thought patterns of the audience, be it the people or the presumed elites? On the other hand, beyond the discussion of functionality, mass media is the communicational foundation of mass society, thus all related discussions are existential problems for the society. Under these stalemate circumstances, the technological revolution of the New Media had more or less, for the better or the worse, to be a game changer.

As with the mainstream media, the New Media also had to begin with the burden of overexpectation. In 2015, social network usage consisted 22% of online time, (Nielsen Company, 2015) which would increase if definition of social media had been wider. As of October 2020, 4.08 billion social media users (www.statista.com, 2020) worldwide were online on smartphones. Because platforms tend to incorporate with time ever more functions with the aim to broaden their audience, many of them may end up with more similarities than differences, it also promotes interconnectedness and convergence throughout the whole of the Internet which again challenges scope and definition. With a wider encompassing definition,

the actual social media use percentage in online time may count much more. As the new media in and the social media increasingly occupies more of the way lives and communication were done, it emerged not only as a dynamic factor in cultural rhetoric, it also established into a culture itself. While traditional modernism viewed technological developments as inherently positive, today, negative effects and potentials of harm make the ways technology is used are subjected to increasing criticism. The immense potential of new media for global change is neither well understood nor are there guidelines for different geographies and cultures for control and direction.

The hard to reign power of unconventional media makes most governments throughout the world uncomfortable, because it requires a sophisticated consent production and public opinion direction system to cancel out uncoordinated voices, which have only the "developed" nations as of the present time. On the other hand, also all social network administrations, how big or small, have their own ideological sets of rules, the social media landscape is not unregulated. Beyond ideological and political intentions, the sheer volume of the stream of daily added content has to be managed for enabling accessibility, visibility, and relatability by preference algorithms shaped by the audience. Also, social media has shown itself to be very suitable to irresponsible harmful assaults against persons, groups and organisations which required strict legal regulation. Another abuse is the developmental effects of sexual content of children and adolescents but also with a potentially psychological detrimental exploitation of "free" adults. The infrastructure that can support human trafficking -children and adults alike. Regulations trying to address this moral and legal harm potential is being debated from the aspects of transparency, plurality, justice, human rights, freedom of speech among others.   .

An important feature of the hybrid media system that it comes with a new set of factors that have influence on the framing process.

1. The Social Media as a Game Changer

While definitions of social media may differ in relation to scope and functions approaches they address, there is agreement on the main points: "forms of electronic communication (such as websites for social networking and microblogging) through which users create online communities to share information, ideas, personal messages, and other content (such as videos) (Merriam-Webster, 2022)." Understandably, many researchers preferred to use *Social Media* exclusively in relation to social media networks. Aichner and Jacob (2015) made a list of 13 kinds of social media,: "blogs, collaborative project management, enterprise social networking, business networks, forums, microblogs, photo sharing, products/services review, social bookmarking, social gaming, social networks, video sharing, and virtual worlds." The beginnings of the social media has been frequently dated with the beginnings of the Internet, then the Bulletin Board Systems in North America, but it would be more accurate to begin with the inclusion of the World Wide Web in the mid-1990ies. Six Degrees is considered to be the first social network, that provided profiles, friends lists and school affiliations for registered users (Heidemann et al., 2012).

1.1. Media Hybridisation

In the age of New Media, the most important change in framing studies has been possibly the phenomenon of the "hybrid media", depicting the symbiotic news system of social media news production with the traditional news media that managed to establish itself successfully on the internet, thus partially maintaining its traditional powers of agenda setting, gatekeeping, public opinion influencing.

As social media users share news on the networks, they do important agenda setting and also *reframing* functions by choosing some news above others, by selecting particular social-cultural interpretations, say rhetoric of the event (Aruguete and Calvo, 2018). While this act of legitimisation and establishes maintains some news authority to a more or less mainstream New Media, it also empowers news sources of questionable authenticity, responsibility and competency by including these into the boundaries of reputable news sources which then works as a part of the disinformation network (Chadwick et al., 2018).

To understand the implications of the media hybridization as a media revolution we should consider the new fields of relevant media research that opened to study these: including the fragmentation of the media system, the rise of a transnational/global discourses.

2. Social Media, Virtual Communities and Activism

An important field for framing research opened in the social media communication of social movements that happened to overlap into the emerging field of virtual communities research (Schrum, 1995; Nocera, 2002; Snow et al. 2018). The proliferation of virtual communities as established around the dynamics of social media, migrated most of the framing research with all its diversity of fields, topics, issues etc. to social media. While virtuality of communities meant that many of had short-lived temporary lifespans, temporary membership bonds, temporary communication hierarchies etc., but nevertheless, their fast paces of instant interactive communication is making up for these. Also, many virtual communities happened to mirror offline social movements, or organised as more or less distanced children of social/political movements with more or less longevity determined by the changes in shared action objectives. Global social media networks facilitated a permanent presence of social mobilization for war and peace, climate change in a transnational context. While practical influence for these social movements is still subject to debate, more independence for personal choices in virtual community identification made up for a wider but more fluid community population, thus are more conform to the premises of the New Social Movements approach (Carty & Onyett, 2006).

The critical role of social media in recent political upheavals has been hotly debated on the cases of the "Arab Spring", the "Euro-maidan" and others, yet it appears that the communication factor in each case functions only on the peculiar fundaments of the complex social-political interaction structures of each particular society. Thus, arguably, while having mass communication channels beside a government controlled dysfunctional media system is critically important for the coordination of various oppositional movements, it requires beforehand these already developed movements. Social media makes no substitute for the lack of social and political power.

The journalist Malcolm Gladwell (2011) made the case that while the social media makes self-expression easier for activists, it also mutes their impact. Activism to be called as such, requires strong relationships, organisational hierarchies, coordination, motivation, making sacrifices like coming out from the woods, sacrificing private life etc. On the other hand, it has been stated that social media are built on virtual ties that cannot be strong as "real acquaintances", thus, social media's easiness for participation comes with lesser engagement and dedication. Kwak et. al. (2018) argued in their study that politically expressive individuals on social media tend to be participatory also in offline political interactions.

2.1. Network Society

Castells (2007), described the transformation potential that came with the internet based communication organisation of the society with "Network society". While the historical evidence of the transformation effects of any novel development in information and communication technologies has been proven as highly paradoxical in the governance of societal problems, on the other hand, no solution approach has ever been considered for societal change that excluded the fundamental functions of interaction say communication.

An important dilemma arises with the rise of perceived efficiency of time use: accessibility comes with increasing numbers of contacts, increasing communication potential directed users into overwhelming circles and flows that were never dreamt and thus are well beyond the "design limits" of human control. This brought another important dimension of network society, namely control by algorithms rather than "real" individuals.

Social media is not just a new forum for public debate as an extension to traditional media, rather it is a fundamentally new public space that converges the personal with the group and social, that challenges the political with the private that Castells (2015) defines as the "new public sphere". Actors in this new space try to harness communication power with the aim to influence opinion and debate via the discourse production process. While Castells (2007) and Klijn and Koppenjan (2012) state that with the

technological boost in availability, accessibility and interaction of information in social networks, governance is bound to move from the institutions to the communication space of the network society, the unforeseen paradoxical effects of new technologies make researchers cautious.

On the other hand, network society opens new theoretical perspectives for a better understanding of social reality. However, such fundamental approaches need time for empirical findings in an ongoing information revolution.

Giant social media networks as Facebook and Twitter, interlinked personal and institutional pages by sharing, hyperlinks, hashtags and retweets to form quick interacting communication flows that influences news production, political communication and organisational communication. This system gives actors more framing power if they manage to resonate with willing audience frames in relation to an ongoing topic or debate. While politicians have readily understood the framing capabilities of social media accounts to contact with their target audiences, organisational communicators and more importantly, social movements and non-profit organisations are engaged in continuous framing contests to prevail their view of the event.

While the social character of inter-group relations maintains localities which come with a plurality of network societies throughout the Internet (Klijn and Koppenjan, 2012), nevertheless the speed of the information flow constitutes an undisputed power for more globalisation. This in turn comes with new interdependencies that foster feelings of threats, vulnerability and negative inclinations of reactive nationalism, xenophobia, pessimism, insecurity etc..

2.2. Populism, Polarisation and Media

The traditional liberalist mainstream media regime and ideology functioned as a continuous cultivation system reproducing a hegemony of the established dominant ideology of the nation. This has been the main cause of resentment by the left wing of progressivism as the main barricade against the political changes towards progress agenda, namely education the ignorant people. In the 80es, the real challenge to the liberalist media system evolved not in the form of a so called alternative media, on the contrary, it was the conservative part of the establishment who at last came to the decision to break with the media establishment and to claim to be the voice of the people. Thus began the populism and polarisation debate of the mainstream media. This annex to the mainstream media has been since criticised from the context of journalism values, ethics and etc., but wasn't it anyway ridiculous to wish for a democracy without plebs, without activism from the contrary, with false pluralism? It seems that after WW2, a class of educated writers and readers emerged and picked up the notion, contrary to classical liberalism, that an ideologically "unified" media would serve democracy better. But, it is a fact that this professional ideology and culture of the mainstream media has never been able to fulfil any of its promises for change towards a more democratic society. Why mourn over polarisation?

First and most, the emergence of monopolistic information giants like Google and Facebook, Twitter and Youtube are shaping the global construction of communicable reality by the power of concentrating content supply. The sheer impossible stream of information makes it easier to drown the algorithmically marginal, a phenomenon felt by the masses and punished by gestures of virtual secession: aversion from the establishment to the boldness of perceived marginalized challengers that revolt for unconformity. Masses deliberately select the exposure to misinformation and opinions that express "their" excluded attitudes, values and distrust fuelled by resentment over "elitist" sources of credibility. What has been acknowledged as the right of progressive youth since The Enlightenment, is now the source of intellectual panic of those who deemed themselves as the rights-holders to information command. They may have right in their protest that the new system makes it way easier to exploit and misuse the masses, but it is also undeniable that the system ceded unprecedented power to the people for agenda setting and opinion forming whether they were qualified or not for responsible use.

3. Social Media Induced Methodological Improvements in Framing Research

The vastness but also the new possibilities of New Media stimulated searches for better, say more efficient but also more precise ways of seeking frames in not only textual but also inside picture linked

contexts. Matthes and Kohring (2008) suggested a better frame mapping approach to hunt for frames not only linguistic instances but also as an integrated meta-communication factor for a particular communication context. This approach on the one hand helped to overcome the perceived lack of important frame features in micro-blogging utterances (tweeting), and on the other hand, also widened frame hunting potential by computer detection of word-clusters throughout the internet.

Developed key relations for the operationalisation of frames make the identifying of frames in text more accurate, even in automatized searches and even with metaphorical and literary language use (Burgers et al., 2016).

The emergence of social media transformed framing research in more than one ways. The dissimilar dynamics of social media enabled new research objectives, scopes and sample audiences, thus improving applicable techniques for studies (D'Angelo, 2018; Entman and Usher, 2018). The digitisation of the research agenda made fields and contexts that had been more difficult to access, easier to approach, be it in media studies, political communication, citizen behaviour, or social movements etc, (Caccatiore, Scheufele, Iyengar, 2016). The novel easy accessibility of various wide, niche, big and specialty sample pools, and the more precise measurability potential without the need of elaborate experiment settings, and also easier longitudinal research led to a proliferation in the quantity and quality in framing effect studies. This all resulted in a more balanced distribution of studies throughout the research agenda.

New designs were required for the analysis of the high volume high speed peculiar communication flow of microblogs. New user related behaviour emerged one after one and also continued to change within months and years, presenting researchers very dynamic phenomena. As an example, it was found that arguably the most used feature of the social media was the facilitation to selective exposure to unverified but discursively sympathetic sources that resulted in landslide misinformation (Guess et al, 2020). A particularly research friendly novelty is the easiness of conducting online user focused surveys and to compare the findings to online user behaviour (Chadwick et al., 2018).

Political communication researchers increasingly studied the use of personal frames as media frames in the social media in relation to perceptions of populism, be it for Bolsonaro in Brasil (Araújo and Prior 2021), Trump in the USA (Sahly et al., 2019) or be it in Europe in the context of Brexit (Ruzza and Pejovic, 2019; Corbett, 2016) among others.

The agenda setting power of the traditional mainstream media of limiting international issues and shaping their discourses in the national agenda, lost its relative monopoly in the age of New Media which resulted in a trend in framing research on social media with a more focus on global issues like climate change (O'Neill et al.,2015), the Euro crisis (Joris et al., 2014) or pandemics (Fisher Liu, 2011; Layne et al., 2020). Also comparative cultural studies among countries gained traction with the help of framing on social media (Bail, 2016).

As a result of the development of picture and video based social media, the analysis of mere texts -be it journalistic or social- became inappropriate at least, requiring visual framing analysis to complement interactions with text and context (Makhortikh and Sydorova, 2017; Rodriguez & Dimitrova, 2011; Pantti, 2013)

Political frame analysis, be it in the form of personal Twitter communication of an administration leader, like the popularly frequent analyses of US President Trump (Meeks, 2020), political institutions (Xiong, & Boatwright, 2019) government agency like the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs during the 2014 Gaza War (Manor and Crilley, 2018), appeared the most similar of media framing analysis.

Meraz and Papacharissi (2013) viewed retweeting as a bridge in frame setting and frame building process on a given continuing debate context. In such a process, citizen communicators contributed to "networked framing" in cooperation with group leaders where "frames were persistently revised, rearticulated and redispersed by both crowd and elite". But the power for frame influencing is different in relation to the roles of plain contributors and communicational elites, say group leaders.

Conclusion

Framing Theory references communicational frames as social/cultural conventions of discourse units that are established/negotiated for the time being by users and that define relationships and actions of

social actors in means of social/political/morale responsibilities. This social constructivist process worked historically in the establishment and use of language in books of various literatures but also in the everyday language of interpersonal communication of the people.

The emergence of the daily mass media revolutionized framing usage by widening and amplifying the defining authority of authors for the whole of society. While this process suggests potential for monopolization for social/cultural frames but also fragmenting a agreed social reality along class/group demarcations and thus spawn polarized ideological paradigm shifts. This language construction-usage process forms a daily social-linguistic bargaining contest between the media representatives of social groupings. Today, frames are used not also in mass media texts but also in other stances of interpersonal communication that may use message units like pictures, footages etc. and interrelations of these.

The emergence of the Internet and in particular the social media consisted a new revolutionary step for social construction of language, inserting the reader into the interaction loop of media actors, a process that added interpersonal communication features to mass media. Nevertheless, while the prophesized equalizing power against the dominance of social-political power structures has not shown up yet, social media has made the bargaining of defining the social reality is becoming an increasingly complicated course. While the enthusiasm of these who anticipated the Internet as an equalizer in social/cultural transformation politics has been partially frustrated by the transportation of organized economic interests into the Internet realm, and the prevailing of the mainstream media as institutions for social/political control, nevertheless, the social media is still a handful to restrain.

While established theories that tried to explain the working dynamics of traditional mass media are still being used in understanding some aspects of new media, nevertheless, the usage and interaction patterns of various social media platforms and channels required and established its new sociological, political, psychological approaches for study. On the other hand, the developments in this field are still changing fast to be deemed as established.

Social media is being widely used by various institutional and individual users for various purposes on various contexts which enables applicability to virtually unlimited research fields, topics and approaches. The sometimes conceptual capaciousness that has been criticized by many as conceptual "fragmentation" allows for commodious flexibility even outside media studies. This all makes frame analysis one of the most suitable tools for social media based research.

Extended Abstract

A most relevant area of study in new media framing research has been the various aspects of the hybrid media system that emerged from the interaction of "traditional media" as digital newspapers, institutionally organized Internet news outlets, TV's etc., with the news and vision production and interpretation of inherently "individual oriented" genuine Internet media as social media, bloggers and forums and so on. The more individual oriented social media as a source for frames enables an unprecedented shortcut of audience frames to enter into mainstream media, thus a potential for affecting if not transforming the main media functions of frame setting, agenda setting, public opinion formation processes (Tewksbury and Riles, 2018) .

Twitter microblogging is possibly the most critical mode of communication nowadays, since it lends to active and fast communication bridging between various modes of communication like individual-institutional, political-personal, individual-intra group-intergroup communication, private-public etc. These qualities are used by worldwide users of billions individuals and temporary or permanent virtual communities. Twitter acts a platform for integrating communication on other social media like Facebook, YouTube, Instagram, Reddit, etc. and dedicated sites. The restricted word volume of microblogging is promoting strong framing, that is, mostly one-sided/unbalanced, indicting, polarizing, unchecked discourse streams that could also be viewed alternatively as strong opinions for individual/social/political engagement, morale stances for social/political responsibility, in short, communication of the free. Yet, no developmental stage of any local or virtual community is intellectually mature to meet ideal ethical standards for framing.

The main framing devices used to establish and direct virtual communities in this fast paced public sphere are keywords (Scott, 2018). Hashtags are frequently used as collective action frames, as call to arms, thus, they are the spells for establishing, maintaining, representing the identity of the a virtual community, a feat which cannot be achieved without excluding persons/identities, attitudes, beliefs, symbols, utterances and other elements of social/cultural construction. Popular hashtags live usually only for one collective action cycle, but in some instances they can live longer in relation to the coverage area and lifespan of the virtual community that used it.

Framing effects of microblogging constitute the most influential factors in agenda setting, public opinion, social movements, and political communication on social media. But, unfortunately, they are also the main influences in all perceived and real evils of social media, namely disinformation, misinformation, media hypes, propaganda, polarization, slandering, bad populism, warmongering, ethnocentrism etc. Framing in social media can be influenced by numbers, not only of real persons, but also virtual numbers that can be built and managed by financial power to effectively sway public opinion and the public debate.

Media hypes in traditional media as well as in the social media, are defined as peak periods of public attention that are generally unpredicted, largely self-motivated –even if steered partially by virtual communities -, having the resources for maintaining it's own agenda, where the relative significance of topics may be disproportionally exaggerated, in short a more distorted representation of the local social reality. Framing processes that are instrumental in the triggering of media hypes are frame amplification, frame expansion, frame alignment, problematisation. Because frame setting is a process where frames elected by actors in communication elected for resonating with frames established in the social consciousness of receivers namely audience frames gain immediate and widespread acceptance by liking and retweeting in the public debate. Feedback cycles may trigger a snowball effect where mainstream media actors and also political or virtual actors may see it wise to readjust their profiles and stances. It can be said that many fundamental framing dynamics of social media in personification, preferring some agendas over others, polarization, readily dissemination to other networks, are in fact facilitating media hypes. This may be an acceptable price of users, for the relative power of defining watchdogs and opinion leaders. Easy access and video uploading smartphones has made social media the first source for news leaking. Political and other social actors are mostly involved personally and institutionally in the social media which makes addressing open letter communication very effective. These and other utilities unfortunately lend also unprecedented power for fake news propagation and abuse for disruptive, destructive, harmful manipulative intentions and agitations.

The echo chamber effect of virtual community framing indeed facilitates polarization which is discredited by mainstream stances that rather emphasize aligning and harmonizing social stances in the public debate but is deemed indispensable agitation for social movement activists. The echo chamber effect has been found (Vaccari and others, 2016) to be determined by conditions like the political communication style of the particular users, their offline relationships, source research for online information acquisition and others Frame discourses in Twitter usually form by internal links and are peculiar to each virtual group, while news are propagated via intergroup links to other virtual communities and networks. The speed of news and information propagation may significantly increase by intermediate persons with multi-group adherence (Grabowicz and others, 2012). Virtual community communicators aim their agendas and opinions to be monitored and ultimately adopted by mainstream media outlets, thus supporting their causes in the public debate. The interlinking of networks can make moving local/national agendas into international agenda easier. But the ultimate dictating of international agenda is not dictated by social media or alternative media. Nothing has changed there, it is still a business of the national government, and the mainstream media that was ever aligned even embedded. This fact supports the notion that the Internet is the most powerful communication and growth media for in the hands of global processes and powers.

Possibly, a certain constructive and positive aspect of the Internet may be the easy access to past, comprehensive and accurate information on any topic on the debate. This, will hopefully cultivate an appreciation for communication, knowledge and learning.

Social media is not different from traditional communication regimes, thus framing effects are not used solely for the good of the public, not only for the rightful, "the righteous" but also against the worthy rights and interests of minorities for various reasons.

But beyond else, the diffusion power of New Media in general promises more personal governance potential over alternative sources for selection beyond the noise, but only for the educated, informed, responsible, moralist, mature individual user who values personal enlightenment beyond everything. It still is a viable alternative to manage the information bombardment of doubtful personal significance, more related to their personal existential development adventures.

Keywords: Frame Analysis, Social Media, Mass Media, Virtual Communities

References

Ahmed, S.- Jaeho, C. – Kokil, J. (2019). Framing social conflicts in news coverage and social media: A multicountry comparative study. *International Communication Gazette* 81: 346–71.

Aichner, T.; Jacob, F. (March 2015). "Measuring the Degree of Corporate Social Media Use" (https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283073224). *International Journal of Market Research.*

Araújo, B., & Prior, H. (2021). Framing political populism: The role of media in framing the election of Jair Bolsonaro. Journalism Practice, 15(2), 226-242.

Aruguete, N., & Calvo, E. (2018). Time to# protest: Selective exposure, cascading activation, and framing in social media. Journal of communication, 68(3), 480-502.

Bail, C. A. (2016). Cultural carrying capacity: Organ donation advocacy, discursive framing, and social media engagement. Social Science & Medicine, 165, 280-288.

Bartlett, F. C.(1932) Remembering, A Study in Experimental and Social Psychology. Cambridge at the University Press. Great Britain. Downloaded: 2022. https://pure.mpg.de/rest/items/item_2273030/component/file_2309291/content

Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an Ecology of Mind.* Jason Aronson Inc, Notvale, New Jersey

Blasco-Duatis, M.- Coenders, G.- Saez, M.- Garcia, N.F.- Cunha. I.F.(2019). Mapping the agenda-setting theory, priming and the spiral of silence in Twitter accounts of political parties. *International Journal of Web Based Communities*, 15(1): 4-24.

Borah, P. (2011) Conceptual issues in framing theory: A systematic examination of a decade's literature. *Journal of Communication*, 61: 246–263.

Burgers, C., Konijn, E. A., & Steen, G. J. (2016). Figurative framing: Shaping public discourse through metaphor, hyperbole, and irony. Communication theory, 26(4), 410-430.

Carty, V., & Onyett, J. (2006). Protest, cyberactivism and new social movements: The reemergence of the peace movement post 9/11. Social Movement Studies, 5(3), 229-249.

Castells, M (2007). Communication, Power and Counter-power in the Network Society, *International Journal of Communication 1*, 238-266

Domingo, D.- Heinonen, A. (2008). Weblogs and journalism: A typology to explore the blurring boundaries. *Nordicom Review*, 29(1)

D'angelo, P. (2018). Doing news framing analysis II. Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives.

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

Entman, R.M.- Usher, N. (2018). Framing in a fractured democracy: Impacts of digital technology on ideology, power and cascading network activation. *Journal of Communication* 68: 298–308.

Cacciatore, M. A., Scheufele, D. A., & Iyengar, S. (2016). The end of framing as we know it… and the future of media effects. Mass communication and society, 19(1), 7-23.

Carragee, K.M.- Roefs, Wim (2004). The neglect of power recent framing research. *International Communication Association*, June, 214-233

Castells, M. (2015). Networks of outrage and hope: Social movements in the Internet age. John Wiley & Sons.

Chadwick, A.- Vaccari, C. - O'Loughlin, B. (2018). Do tabloids poison the well of social media? Explaining democratically dysfunctional news sharing. *New Media & Society* 20: 4255–74.

Corbett, S. (2016). The social consequences of Brexit for the UK and Europe: Euroscepticism, populism, nationalism, and societal division. The International Journal of Social Quality, 6(1), 11-31.

Fisher Liu, B. F., & Kim, S. (2011). How organizations framed the 2009 H1N1 pandemic via social and traditional media: Implications for US health communicators. Public relations review, 37(3), 233-244.

Fuchs, C. (2013). Social Media: A Critical Introduction. SAGE, 2013.

Gamson, W. A., & Modigliani, A. (1987). The changing culture of affirmative action. In R. G. Braungart & M. M. Braungart (Eds.), Research in political sociology (Vol. 3, pp. 137–177). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Gamson, W. A. (1989). News as framing: Comments on Graber. American Behavioral Scientist, 33, 157–166.

Gitlin, T. (1980). *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making and the unmaking of the New Left. Berkely*. CA: University of California Press.

Gladwell, Malcolm (March 1, 2011). "Malcolm Gladwell and Clay Shirky on Social Media and Revolution, Foreign Affairs March/April 2011" (https://web.archive.org/web/20110201165430/http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/67325/malcolm-gladwell-and-clay-shirky/from-innovation-to-revolution). Foreign Affairs (March/April 2011). Archived from the original (http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/67325/malcolm-gladwell-and-clay-shirky/from-innovation-to-revolution) on 2011-02-01.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Grabowicz, P. a., Ramasco, J. J., Moro, E., Pujol, J. M., & Eguiluz, V. M. (2012). Social features of online networks: The strength of intermediary ties in online social media. PLoS ONE, 7(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0029358

Guess, A., Nyhan, B., & Reifler, J. (2018). Selective exposure to misinformation: Evidence from the consumption of fake news during the 2016 US presidential campaign. European Research Council, 9(3), 4.

Hamdy, N.- Gomaa, E.H.(2012). Framing the Egyptian uprising in Arabic language newspapers and social media, *Journal of Communication*, 62(2): 195-211

Harlow, S.- Kilgo, D.K.- Salaverria, R.- García-Perdomo. V. (2020). Is the whole world watching? Building a typology of protest coverage on social media from around the world. *Journalism Studies* 21: 1590–608

Heidemann, J.- Klier, M.-, Probst, F. (2012) Online social networks: A survey of a global phenomenon. *Computer Networks*. Volume 56, Issue 18, 17 December 2012, Pages 3866-3878. ScienceDirect.com

Hopke, J.E.- Hestres, L.E. (2018). Visualizing the Paris climate talks on Twitter: Media and climate stakeholder visual social media during COP21. *Social Media+ Society* 4(3)

Joris, W., d'Haenens, L., & Van Gorp, B. (2014). The euro crisis in metaphors and frames: Focus on the press in the Low Countries. European Journal of Communication, 29(5), 608-617.

Kahneman, D. - Tversky, A. (1984). Choices, values, and frames, *American Psychologist*, 39, 341-350

Klijn, E. H., & Koppenjan, J. (2012). Governance network theory: past, present and future. Policy & Politics, 40(4), 587-606.

Knüpfer, C.B.- Entman, R.M. (2018). Framing conflicts in digital and transnational media environments. *Media, War & Conflict* 11: 476–88.

Layne, S. P., Hyman, J. M., Morens, D. M., & Taubenberger, J. K. (2020). New coronavirus outbreak: Framing questions for pandemic prevention. Science translational medicine, 12(534), eabb1469.

Lovejoy, K.- Saxton, G.D. (2012) Information, community, and action: How nonprofit organizations use social media. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication 17(3): 337–353

Makhortykh, M., & Sydorova, M. (2017). Social media and visual framing of the conflict in Eastern Ukraine. Media, war & conflict, 10(3), 359-381.

Manor, I., & Crilley, R. (2018). Visually framing the Gaza War of 2014: The Israel ministry of foreign affairs on Twitter. Media, War & Conflict, 11(4), 369-391.

Matthes, J., & Kohring, M. (2008). The content analysis of media frames: Toward improving reliability and validity. Journal of communication, 58(2), 258-279.

Meeks, L. (2020). Defining the enemy: How Donald Trump frames the news media. Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 97(1), 211-234.

Meraz, S., & Papacharissi, Z. (2013). Networked gatekeeping and networked framing on# Egypt. The international journal of press/politics, 18(2), 138-166.

Merriam-Webster online dictionary. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/social%20media retrieved: 2022

Messner, M.- DiStaso, M. W. (2008). The source cycle: How traditional media and weblogs use each other as sources. Journalism Studies, 9(3), 447-463.

Nielsen Company. "Social Networks Blogs Now Account for One in Every Four and a HalfMinutes Online" (http://www.nielsen.com/us/en/insights/news/2010/social-media-accounts-for-22-percent-of-time-online.html). Nielsen.

Nocera, J. L. A. (2002). Ethnography and hermeneutics in cybercultural research accessing IRC virtual communities. Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 7(2), JCMC721.

O'Neill, S., Williams, H. T., Kurz, T., Wiersma, B., & Boykoff, M. (2015). Dominant frames in legacy and social media coverage of the IPCC Fifth Assessment Report. Nature climate change, 5(4), 380-385.

Pantti, M. (2013). Seeing and not seeing the Syrian crisis: New visibility and the visual framing of the Syrian conflict in seven newspapers and their online editions. JOMEC journal.

Piaget, J. (1952). The origins of intelligence in children. (M. Cook, Trans.). W W Norton & Co. https://doi.org/10.1037/11494-000

Qin, J. (2015). Hero on Twitter, traitor on news: How social media and legacy news frame Snowden. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 20: 166–84

Rodriguez, L., & Dimitrova, D. V. (2011). The levels of visual framing. Journal of visual literacy, 30(1), 48-65.

Ruzza, C., & Pejovic, M. (2019). Populism at work: the language of the Brexiteers and the European Union. Critical Discourse Studies, 16(4), 432-448.

Sahly, A., Shao, C., & Kwon, K. H. (2019). Social media for political campaigns: An examination of Trump's and Clinton's frame building and its effect on audience engagement. Social Media+ Society, 5(2), 2056305119855141.

Saperas, Enric, and Ángel Carrasco-Campos. 2015. The operationalization of the concept of framing in the Journal of Communication(2009–2013): Objects of study, research techniques and theoretical construction. Communication & Society 28: 49–66.

Scheufele, D. (1999). Framing as a theory of media effect. *Journal of Communication*, 49(1), 103–122.

Scheufele, D. A.,- Tewksbury, D. (2007). Framing, agenda setting, and priming: The evolution of three media effects models. *Journal of Communication,* 57(1), 9-20.

Schrum, L. (1995). Framing the debate: Ethical research in the information age. Qualitative Inquiry, 1(3), 311-326.

Scott, K. (2018). "Hashtags work everywhere": The pragmatic functions of spoken hashtags. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 22: 57–64.

Snow, D.- Benford, R. (1988). Ideology frame resonance, and participant mobilization. *International Social Movements Research*, 1: 197–217.

Snow, D. A., & Bernatzky, C. (2018). The coterminous rise of right-wing populism and superfluous populations. In Populism and the Crisis of Democracy (pp. 130-146). Routledge.

Tewksbury, D., & Riles, J. M. (2018). Framing in an interactive news environment. Doing News Framing Analysis II, 137-162.

Tuchman, G. (1978). *Making news. A study in the construction of reality.* New York: Knopf

Vaccari, C.- Valeriani, A.- Barber.- Jost, P. J. T.- Nagler , , J. - Tucker, J. A. (2016) Of echo chambers and contrarian clubs: Exposure to political disagreement among German and Italian users of twitter. *Social Media Soc.*, 2 (3): 1–24.

Williams, B.A.- Delli Carpini, M. (2004). Monica and Bill all the time and everywhere: The collapse of gatekeeping and agenda setting in the new media environment. *American Behavioral Scientist 47 (9)*, 1208-1230.

www.statista.com/statistics/617136/digital-population-worldwide/)

Xiong, Y., Cho, M., & Boatwright, B. (2019). Hashtag activism and message frames among social movement organizations: Semantic network analysis and thematic analysis of Twitter during the# MeToo movement. Public relations review, 45(1), 10-23.