

Forthcoming as Paasonen, Susanna, *Resonant Networks: On Affect and Social Media*. In Anne Fleig and Christian von Scheve (eds.), *Public Spheres of Resonance: Constellations of Affect and Language*. London: Routledge.

## **Resonant networks: On affect and social media**

Susanna Paasonen

In an era of clickbait journalism, Twitter storms, and viral social media campaigns varying from social protest to commodity promotion, it has become strikingly clear that networked communications are not merely about critical rational exchange or functional information retrieval, but equally – and perhaps even more explicitly – an issue of affective exchanges and connections of both the fleeting and more lasting kind. As argued in this chapter, the notion of affective resonance provides a means of accounting for encounters with the world in which bodies move from one state to another, and possibly become transformed in the process. This conceptualization is hardly specific to online phenomena as such, and it is used here to explore affective encounters between people, networks, interfaces, apps, devices, digital images, sounds, and texts in the context of social media. Moving from my own considerations of resonance in connection with online pornography to examinations of the role, both pronounced and not, that affect has played in Internet research, this chapter asks how affect matters and makes things matter in a contemporary media landscape driven by the quests for attention, viral circulation, and affective stickiness.

## **Things to do with resonance**

In academic conference jargon, resonance refers to arguments and points that somehow relate to, or echo those previously made by others, possibly in ways difficult to precisely pin down. The notion of resonance carries multiple meanings across disciplinary boundaries and discursive contexts varying from linguistics to physics, chemistry, astronomy, electronics, and medicine. According to the more literal thesaurus definitions, “If something has a resonance for someone, it has a special meaning or is particularly important to them”. Resonance then refers to the “power to evoke enduring images, memories, and emotions” as well as to the “intensification and prolongation of sound, especially of a musical tone, produced by sympathetic vibration”. Connected to a “quality of richness or variety” and to “a quality of evoking response”, resonance further stands for “oscillation

induced in a physical system when it is affected by another system that is itself oscillating at the right frequency”.<sup>1</sup>

Across these different definitions, resonance is descriptive of instances of connection, motion, and amplification that are generative of importance, feeling, meaning, and memory and that entail “adjacency, sympathy, and the collapse of the boundary between perceiver and perceived” (Erlmann, 2010, p. 2). Despite its interdisciplinary applications, the notion of resonance has, possibly for obvious reasons, been largely connected to studies of sound and noise within humanities inquiry (see Erlmann, 2010; Goddard, Halligan, & Hegarty, 2012). My own work with the concept draws on long-term research on pornography, the studies of which have historically been dominated by a focus on the politics of representation drawing from feminist film theory. In studies of pornography, visual concepts have oriented attention toward relations of power, practices objectification and identification, as well as toward the routines of representation through which hierarchies connected to identity categories such as gender, race, and class are amplified and further bolstered. While there are good reasons to focus on the visual when analysing contemporary pornography that is largely consumed in the format of online video clips, this emphasis has its conceptual limitations in accounting for the genre’s force and appeal connected to the power of different kinds of bodies to affect and be affected. In order to examine the affective appeal of online porn, I turned to the notion of resonance to address its visceral, often ambivalent grab, as well as the ways in which its depictions of bodies moving from one state to another can set the bodies of those viewing into motion, from sexual arousal to disgust, shame, interest, amusement, and any combination thereof (see Paasonen, 2011).

In the course of this exploration, resonance became a means to describe the ways in which users attach themselves to site interfaces, images, sounds, videos, texts, tags, and search terms and how they perhaps come to recognize some of the sensations conveyed on the screen in their own bodies. With resonance, I wanted to tackle the interactive and material nature of such encounters and attachments, their dynamics and appeal. Used in this vein, affect refers to instantaneous intensities of feeling that emerge in encounters with the world and precede cognitive processing. Emotions become identified, recognized, and labeled through affective intensities that lend them both force and quality.

---

<sup>1</sup> See <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/resonance>; <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/resonance>; <https://www.thefreedictionary.com/Wave+resonance>; <http://www.dictionary.com/browse/resonance>

More than a technical term, resonance is descriptive of instances of being moved, touched, and affected by that which is tuned to “the right frequency”. In other words, it entails instances of attunement as momentary connections and impact. Without a frequency for bodies to resonate with one another, no connection can be formed, sensed, or made sense of. In addition, all resonance alters in form and intensity over time in ways that render generalizations based on the material, formal, or representational aspects of bodies difficult, if not impossible. As Baruch Spinoza (1992, p. 133) pointed out in his *Ethics*, “[d]ifferent men can be affected in different ways by one and the same object, and one and the same man can be affected by one and the same object in different ways in different times”. Resonance is then a means of addressing the oscillating registers of affect that alter in their qualities, rhythms, speeds, and intensities. There is immediacy and unpredictability to resonance as it possibly bleeds away into blandness (Berlant, 2015), disaffect (Petit, 2015), and boredom as an experience void of qualities (Goodstein, 2005). It should in fact be noted that the boundary between resonance and dissonance is not necessarily a clear one and that the two may well intermesh. Resonances can be experienced as disturbing, unpleasant and revolting kinds of dissonances, or something that become sensed as ambiguous amalgamations of mixed feeling that both titillate and repel.

The motions of human bodies moving onscreen and the motions occurring in the bodies of those watching remain key to the resonances of online pornography, yet these extend equally to media technologies, devices, storage formats, networked connections, representations, online platforms, labels, terms, tags, and categories connected to sexual likes as nodes in an actor network that comprises the “product” of online porn. Online pornography materializes – becomes sensible – in assemblages of bodies of flesh, membrane, and mucus; plastic, silicone, copper, and steel; data, code, text, and iconography. Considered in this vein, the resonances emerging in encounters with online pornography are in fact far from being particular to just this specific media genre. Resonant frequencies and “sympathetic vibrations” can be discovered by accident just as they can be knowingly sought out when browsing through social media updates, when glancing through magazines and newspapers on offer at a newsstand, or when examining the currently available and recommended content on Netflix. Resonances then come across as intensities and events in a broader series of encounters with the world as a means of explaining the appeal, stickiness, and force that some media content holds. I argue that, as a dynamic event where the affective, the somatic, and the cognitive stick and cohere, resonance helps in understanding online connections and disconnections, proximities and distances between human and non-human bodies well beyond

the genre of pornography. Following this line of thought, the remainder of this chapter examines some of the applications of resonance in studies of networked communications, and in those of social media in particular.

### **Affect in Internet research**

Despite its debt to the highly rational framework of informatics drawing from cybernetics, as one of its influential disciplinary background strands, considerations of affect are certainly not alien to, or entirely novel within Internet research. The field has been long engaged with online communities revolving around specific interests, as in connection with practices of fandom, play, sexual exploration, and peer support (e.g., Baym, 2000; Sundén, 2003). Such connections were discussed as affective already in Howard Rheingold's (1993, p. 5) early influential definition of virtual communities as "social aggregations that emerge from the Net when enough people carry on those public discussions long enough, with sufficient human feeling, to form webs of personal relationships in cyberspace".

A possibility for contact, communication, and exchange does not, however, automatically result in, or fuel, a sense of togetherness or belonging: community building, whether online or offline, involves acts of exclusion, and even those of policing, given that there can be no "us" without "them" and no inside without an outside (see Joseph, 2002). Online communities may well be crafted out of hate and be animated by the intensities of violence (Kuntsman, 2007). Furthermore, online communication regularly involves an uneasy balancing of the sharp flames of anger and aggression in ways requiring boundary maintenance, moderation, content filtering, and other forms of intervention. The intensities of aggression emerging from trolling and other forms of intentional provocation of users may well provide sources of enjoyment for some while remaining frustrating and enraging to others (Paasonen, 2015).

It then follows that a scholarly focus on affect should not be confined to "good vibrations" and pleasurable exchanges, just as investigations into resonance ought not exclude dissonances from their agenda. Positive, negative, and ambivalent affect blend into each another on online platforms, shift and slide, and range in their intensities and impact. It can be argued that much of the appeal of social media owes precisely to such intermeshing of positive and negatives affective strands that layer into mutable and possibly sticky tapestry within which user attention travels and halts, where shivers of interest emerge from patterns of boredom, and where amusement and offence

frequently bleed into one another.

From flame wars to the thrills of online romance, the intensities of sexual arousal sought out by browsing for online porn, the fascinations of online shopping, or the pleasures catered by meme culture, networked communications point to the shortcomings of analytical frameworks based on theories of the public sphere as one premised on rational critical exchange. Online publics and communities, when these do emerge, are affective ones, brought together by intensities of feeling, as indirectly suggested by Rheingold already some 25 years ago – and, one might add, the same applies to such movements offline and in the current context of the online/offline binary being increasingly artificial to draw. Following Zizi Papacharissi (2015), affective publics involve shared articulations of emotion that bring forth more or less temporary sense of connection, which, with a contagious kind of intensity, can fuel political action. Her key examples of such political potential involve the Occupy movement and uprisings in North Africa and the Middle East since 2010, the public demonstrations of which were centrally orchestrated, and the intensities of which virally spread through Twitter. More recent protests such as the 2017 and 2018 Women’s Marches in the United States, and elsewhere, have been similarly organized through mainstream social media while the multi-platform movement of #MeToo has, since October 2017, galvanized discussions on sexual harassment, violence, and mundane sexism on a global scale.

Following Papacharissi, a hashtag such as #MeToo is an open-ended framing device that allows for “crowds to be rendered into publics; networked publics that want to tell their story collaboratively and on their own terms. These networked publics come together and/or disband around bonds of sentiment” and convene “across networks that are discursively rendered out of mediated interactions” (Papacharissi, 2015, p. 308.). Affective hashtag publics emerge from, and are mobilized through, shared displays of sentiment, assembling “around media and platforms that invite affective attunement, support affective investment, and propagate affectively charged expression” (Papacharissi, 2015, p. 308). The action they support is connective but not necessarily collective, given the degree to which it involves articulations of personal feeling, experience, and investment woven together in the use of hashtags (Papacharissi, 2015, p. 315). As an affective formation, #MeToo is “textually rendered into being through emotive expressions that spread virally through networked crowds” (Papacharissi, 2015, p. 320). The hashtag connects together experiences from violent rape to occasional catcalling in ways that both help in framing them as interconnected operations of sexism within a hierarchical, unequal gender system, and to a degree dilute and erase essential differences between them.

In her discussion of bestselling fiction, Eva Illouz (2014) deploys the notion resonance to explain how cultural products manage tapping into structures of feeling. Following Raymond Williams (1977), structures of feeling are ephemeral and possibly difficult to translate into language even when acutely felt. As social experiences “in solution”, structures of feelings involve “particular linkages, particular emphases and suppressions” that come sensible as common qualities of life characteristic to specific generations, contexts, and locations (Williams, 1977, pp. 133–134). For something to resonate, it needs “not only to address a social experience that is not adequately understood, named, or categorized but also to ‘frame’ it in adequately explanatory ways” (Illouz, 2014, p. 23). That which resonates strikes a chord and, in doing so, makes it possible to articulate that which is otherwise too ephemeral or hard to express. For its part, the hashtag #MeToo has evident resonance in setting bodies into motion, in driving public debate, in pushing for collective change, and in offering means to articulate personal experiences as patterns in a broader social fabric. Building on John Protevi’s (2009) discussion on political affect, #MeToo makes it possible to connect the somatic, as that which is immediately and corporeally felt, with the social so that personal affectations gain the potential of fuelling political engagement on a collective level.

Equally drawing on Williams, Papacharissi (2016, p. 321) interprets affective publics organized through Twitter hashtags “as structures of feeling, comprising an organically developed pattern of impulses, restraints, and tonality”. The rhythms and communicative practices of particular social media platforms shape the ways in which public formations of sentiment may take shape, how they are able to spread and to become shared. Moving through Twitter and Facebook, and spreading via YouTube and news media internationally, #MeToo has involved viral force – as well as a visceral grab – that has lent it with liveliness exceeding the appeal of any singular tweet or public exposure of misconduct. Such viral activist campaigns possibly leading to dramatic confrontation and public debate are prime examples of how affect drives individual and collective action through resonant intensities of outrage and anger that grow and fade in networked communications. At the same time, there are obvious analytical shortcomings to limiting considerations of networked affect, or those of affective resonance, solely to moments of peak intensity such as those involved in social protest and revolt. There is no reason to limit considerations of bodies being moved from one state to another through affective resonance to dramatic scenes of becoming and transformation, yet investigations into affect have – well beyond the field of Internet research – notably often clustered on transformative events rather than on mundane, ubiquitous, or miniscule oscillations of

sensation. A focus on instances of heightened impact comes at the expense of blindness toward the more banal encounters and minor resonances that comprise the main flow, and pull, of social media, as well as that of everyday lives more generally.

The resonances of online content sought up by exploring cute animal pictures or online celebrity gossip can, following Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi (2000, p. 142, pp. 184–185), be understood as enjoyable, simple, and mundane microflow experiences that, practiced for the sake of enjoyment, offer momentary escapes from the sensations of boredom and anxiety that otherwise haunt everyday lives. By doing so, microflow experiences – from coffee breaks to office banter, or checking one’s Facebook newsfeed – increase people’s sense of aliveness, interest, and energy (Csikszentmihalyi, 2000, pp. 146, 169–170). As minor as they may be, microflow events move bodies from one state to another and affect their capacities of being in the world. In a more new materialist phrasing, such routines and experiences increase and affirm one’s life forces and potentials to act. In his discussion of microshocks, Brian Massumi (2015, p. 53) describes them as affective encounters with the world entailing a change in focus: “In every shift of attention, there is an interruption, a momentary cut in the mode of onward employment of life”. While remaining largely imperceptible in their instantaneity, microshocks, as moments of sensory commotion, may also become registered as interruptions (Massumi, 2015, p. 54).

Combined, these two distinct – yet also mutually resonant – formulations of microevents help to foreground engagements with social media as both intentional pursuits driven by a quest for pleasure (i.e., microflow events) and as unpredictable encounters, affectations, and transformations that are impossible for an individual to foresee or to control (i.e., microshocks). As events, their scale is minor and quotidian, and their recurrence is constant. As networked communications and social media have grown integral to people’s daily rhythms, the microevents that they cater, or at least promise, have become ubiquitous in their immediately availability and virtually endless supply.

### **Click me!**

Although affect has been central to all kinds of networked exchanges throughout the history of the Web, and well before, it has not necessarily been elaborated or fully conceptualized as such. More recently, affective resonances ranging from “articulations of desire, seduction, trust, and

memory; sharp jolts of anger and interest; political passions; investments of time, labor, and financial capital; and the frictions and pleasures of archival practices” have nevertheless grown increasingly recognized as topics of interest within Internet research (Paasonen, Hillis, & Petit, 2015, p. 1; also Karatzogianni & Kuntsman, 2012). This rise in interest connects to how social networking sites, initially recognized as allowing for “public displays of connection” (Donath & Boyd, 2004), have become identified as tapping into affect for the purposes of targeted advertising and corporate value building (see Coté & Pybus, 2007; Dean, 2010; Paasonen, 2018). In the course of this, affect has grown manifest as both a fuel and a resource in social media economy that tries to convert affect to data which, similarly to all data, can be analyzed, manipulated, and turned into monetary profit. Once affect is not seen as merely a social glue or an additional attractor in user engagement but rather as something central to the profit mechanisms of social media, it becomes crucial to investigate both these mechanisms and their connections to the broader network of interests and intensities emerging in networked exchanges (also Terranova, 2004; van Dijck, 2013).

Online platforms of all kinds aim to optimize the volume of visits, shares, likes, and returning users in order to both amp up the price of their advertising schemes and to collect user data for the purposes of targeted advertising (and, as is most likely, for further selling this data to third parties). Operating through targeted advertising rather than membership fees of the kind used in 1990s Web cultures, social media basically aims to engage users; inspire them to post, share, and comment; and to frequently return back to the same platforms. Here, affect emerges as that which manages to capture attention in the ever-shifting landscape of diversion and distraction. Writing on blogging, Jodi Dean (2010, p. 95) argues that affect accrues “from communication for its own sake, from the endless circular movement of commenting, adding notes and links, bringing in new friends and followers, layering and interconnecting myriad communications platforms and devices”. Dean sees affective intensity as driving user motions across posts and applications as they search for distracting thrills and more lingering affectations. When checking Facebook news feeds, trending tweets, or the top tags of Instagram, most content flows by without little attention or impact. When something does grab attention, it leaves some kind of impression, no matter how momentary or minor this may be. This “something” can be conceptualized as instances of resonance that become highly valuable within the attention economy of social media as encounters where something sticks rather than merely slides by.

Theresa Senft (2008) has introduced the notion of the grab to describe the visual and tactile dynamic of visual exchanges online. “The grab” belongs to a media landscape characterized by



user-generated content and the blurred lines of users and producers that differs in its operating principles from those of broadcast and print media. Once images, videos, stories, and webcam streams are made available online, they are out of control as users grab images, link and embed them to other sites, share them, and frame them with comments of their own. The notion of the grab can be equally extended to discussions beyond the visual dynamics of online exchanges to the ways in which we, as users, are “grabbed” as our movements are tracked with the aid of cookies and Internet Protocol addresses, and as our routine tasks are automatically saved and analyzed as data. Users grab the images and technologies by which they are grabbed in return. Sites aim to grab their users while users grab video clips, share and circulate them, and as the content continues to grab new users and hold old ones in their clasp. That which grabs captures attention through instances of resonance that can be weak or strong, momentary or enduring. Depending on the qualities of register involved, users may turn away from the site or application, move even closer to it, or blink in confused disbelief.

Easy, and optimally vast, circulation is pivotal to the profit mechanisms of social media following the imperative, “if it doesn’t spread, it’s dead” (Jenkins, Ford, & Green, 2013, p. 1). Spreadable media content “gains greater resonance in the culture, taking on new meanings, finding new audiences, attracting new markets, and generating new value” through acts of reuse, reworking, and redistribution (Jenkins, 2007). Social media content is readily spread both from one platform to another and within the same one, and the relative success of any post is easy enough to track through the shares, likes, and comments made. All kinds of campaigns, from advertising to activism, aim at virality where content – hashtags, posts, images, video clips, animated GIFs, or something else – gains certain liveliness through its networked sharing, circulation, variation, and multiplication. Basically, virality is descriptive of how online content spreads across platforms and geographical terrains in ways that are not for any single individual or group to plan, to control, or to achieve. In the optimized visibility, attention, spread, reach, and volume of redistribution that virality entails, it remains something of a ubiquitous goal. Virality, in short, speaks of success within the attention economy of social media.

A viral image or video gaining such liveliness is generally one single file – one thing – yet, following Limor Shifman’s (2012) typology, it can be part of a meme. Shifman defines memes first, as a group or collection of texts that share common characteristics of content, form, or stance. Second, memes have been created with awareness of each other (in other words, they are markedly intertextual). Third and perhaps self-evidently, memes are circulated, imitated, and transformed

through online platforms. While most memetic content remains relatively dead as uploads that hardly no one clicks on, shares, or likes, some of it gains virality in the speed in which it gets picked up and in the scales that it spreads. Here, networked media function not merely as passive platforms or instruments for the distribution of man-made content but as crucial to how such content emerges, to how it is encountered and responded to, to how it materializes on different devices, screens, apps, and sites across physical distances, in how it becomes sensible, and possibly resonates. The networks that provide viral content with its semblance of liveliness are comprised of actors both human and not, and it is only within this ecology that memes can emerge and prosper.

Meme, then, is a multiplicity that emerges and multiplies in resonant networks. Like most of contemporary pornography or the #MeToo movement, meme culture is part and parcel of online attention economy living off on spreadability (see Crogan & Kinsley, 2012; Webster, 2014). Users upload files that are then discussed and commented upon, spread, and redistributed as mash-ups and other remixes. In order to inspire circulation, files need to be somehow sticky. In the context of online attention economy, sticky content is that which grabs users “by the eyeballs” (Dery, 2007, p. 135), makes their distracted movements across sites and apps to momentarily come to a halt and encourages further engagement. This is explicitly the key aim of so-called clickbaits that feed, and live off, Facebook and Twitter traffic generated through eye-catching headlines and visuals promising affective jolts, shivers of amusement, interest, and fascination. The central role of affective intensities applies equally to fake news as it does to memes or viral activist campaigns.

Similarly to Tony Sampson (2012, p. 14), I frame virality and stickiness in terms of affectivity, which he identifies as “mesmeric fascinations, passionate interests and joyful encounters”. I would nevertheless add that the registers of dismay, disgust, anger, and outrage may just as well play a key role in how people engage with online content and set in viral circulation of varying lengths and speeds. Outrage alone involves considerable capacity to set bodies into motion, as the virality of the #MeToo movement well illustrates.

### **Qualities of encounter**

The stickiness and circulation of online content to the point of it growing viral can, following Sara Ahmed (2004), be understood as intimately connected to the creation of affective value. For Ahmed (2004, p. 41), who builds loosely on Marx’s theory of capital, affective value increases, or

accumulates, through the circulation of objects and signs. As pointed out above, from the perspective of social media platforms, content that grabs is valuable in its stickiness that makes users pay attention and engage. Links and sites that are sticky in the sense of attracting both new and returning users can be seen as sticky also in the sense discussed by Ahmed – that is, as layered with affect. As an image, a hashtag, or a video clip circulates on social media and evokes novel shares and variations, it increases in affective value and stickiness that then helps to capture the attention of new users. Without such circulation and variation, stickiness may fade fast and its affective intensities evaporate: resonance, after all, comes in different speeds and scales.

The qualities of resonance alter across different encounters, just as they do among different subjects interfacing with the same content. Some content flows by, some remains inaccessible or uninteresting, while yet other grows magnetic with affective intensity. Viral content can circulate with considerable tenacity or disappear after brief visibility. The online resource site “Know Your Meme” alone encapsulates the constant circulation of microevents in its ever expanding, descriptive accounts of memes past and present. Memes can be funny, shocking, offensive, disgusting, odd, plain silly, or merely peculiar, but they may equally involve degrees of social commentary and criticism. In other words, politics, titillation, ambivalence, and pleasure are not mutually exclusive but rather strands in the horizontal texture of social media traffic. This horizontality corresponds with the intermeshing of positive, negative, and ambivalent affective qualities of varying intensity.

Mememes operate centrally through humor that is not necessarily benign, kind, separable from irony and satire – or from misogyny and racism, given the degree to which these run rife across all kinds of online cultures from the markedly geeky to the exclusively political (see Highfield, 2016, pp. 17–18; Phillips, 2015, pp. 96–97; Roberts, 2016, p. 151). The edge necessary for online content to grab attention and to invite comments, likes, shares, and modifications owes to the affective intensities it engenders, whether these are sensed as pleasant, offensive, or blatantly disturbing. In other words, the question is one of resonance, dissonance, and myriad amalgamations thereof. The range of affective intensities involved, combined with the multimodality of the content shared, makes it possible to expand Papacharissi’s discussion of affective publics as primary textual formations of public storytelling. Mememes operating with image and text, often making use of ready-made templates, reaction GIFs generated from video clips, similarly to emojis used for displaying sentiment, connect to textual communication such as tweets, and possibly expand the exchanges toward unpredictable directions.

Memes can fuel political campaigns and, in doing so, contribute to their viral appeal. But memes may just as well gain stickiness from undermining, questioning, or mocking such campaigns. Most of the memes connected to the markedly non-humorous #MeToo movement are political in their tone and many have been focused on highlighting the camaraderie between Hilary Clinton and Harvey Weinstein, the film producer whose long-term habit of sexually harassing younger female actors was made public in the autumn of 2017, marking the beginning of the hashtag public. Some memes mock the women speaking out and question their motives and the veracity of their accounts with what appears to be a general rightwing, anti-feminist agenda. Other memes connect Weinstein with Bill Clinton and the several accusations of harassment squared against him while yet others focus on mocking Weinstein's physical appearance and unpalatable behavior. Visual memes comment on the virality of #MeToo but do not necessarily lend their support to the movement's aims, goals, or key spokespeople. Online exchanges allow for affective resonance to connect bodies toward collective action, yet this is hardly automatically or generally the case. The trajectories of movement and action that these bodies can take are notably diverse, as rife with tension. And, as #MeToo memes indicate, conflict never looms far away in online communication.

In instances of resonance, the representational and material properties of social media content meet the layered, personal, and corporeal histories of the viewing subject. In the context of online pornography, resonance connects to sexual preferences, orientations, fantasies, traumas, embodied memories, and cultural imageries of all kinds. Viral social media content and memes tend to operate with intertextual references and subcultural connotations. The affective rushes and jolts they give rise to are likely to clash with one another and to resist being pinned down into clearly distinct categories. Meanwhile, their temporality is often attached to current events, ranging from the fleetingly instantaneous to the stuff that grabs, lingers, and reverberates for some time to come. In his study of the micro-blogging service, Tumblr, Alexander Cho (2015, p. 44) deploys the notion of reverb to describe how "affect channels and circulates in social media environments". As an extension of resonance, reverb allows for understanding "how intensity interacts with refrain over time and as a function of repetition" (Cho, 2015, p. 53, emphasis in the original). Instances of resonance render things interesting, desirable, and important while their reverberation affords them with temporal extension.

Circulation of social media content evokes specific kinds of networked resonance that contribute to its affective stickiness, the intensities of which grow, linger, and fade away at varying speeds as user attention and interest perpetually circulates, moves, shifts, and relocates. Without resonance, connections fail to be formed; no stickiness accrues; no bodies are affecting or being affected by one another; and no affective intensity of the kind necessary for mobilizing collective action, online or offline, emerges. Without affective resonance of some kind, things simply do not matter – and without reverb, attachments to them remain faint, fleeting, and momentary.

## References

- Ahmed, S. (2004). *The cultural politics of emotion*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Baym, N. (2000). *Tune in, log on: Soap, fandom, and online community*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Berlant, L. (2015). Structures of unfeeling: Mysterious skin. *International Journal of Politics, Culture and Society*, 28(3), 191–213.
- Cho, A. (2015). Queer reverb: Tumblr, affect, time. In K. Hillis, S. Paasonen, & M. Petit (Eds.), *Networked affect* (pp. 33–58). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Coté, M., & Pybus, J. (2007). Learning to immaterial labour 2.0: MySpace and social networks. *Ephemera: Theory & Politics in Organization*, 7(1), 88–106.
- Crogan, P., & Kinsley, S. (2012). Paying attention: Towards a critique of the attention economy. *Culture Machine*, 13, 1–29. Retrieved from <http://culturemachine.net/index.php/cm/article/view/463/482>
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). *Beyond boredom and anxiety: Experiencing flow in work and play* (25th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Dean, J. (2010). *Blog theory: Feedback and capture in the circuits of the drive*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Dery, M. (2007). Paradise lust: Pornotopia meets the culture wars. In K. Jacobs, M. Janssen, & M. Pasquinelli (Eds.), *C'lick me: A netporn studies reader* (pp. 125–148). Amsterdam: Institute of Network Cultures.
- Donath, J., & Boyd, D. (2004). Public displays of connection. *BT Technology Journal*, 22(4), 71–82.
- Erlmann, V. (2010). *Reason and resonance: A history of modern aurality*. New York: Zone Books.
- Goddard, M., Halligan, B., & Hegarty, P. (Eds.). (2012). *Reverberations: The philosophy, aesthetics and politics of noise*. London: Continuum.
- Goodstein, E. S. (2005). *Experience without qualities: Boredom and modernity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

- Highfield, T. (2016). *Social media and everyday politics*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Illouz, E. (2014). *Hard-core romance: "Fifty shades of grey," best-sellers, and society*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Jenkins, H. (2007, April 24). Slash me, mash me, spread me... Confessions of an Aca/Fan. Retrieved from: [http://www.henryjenkins.org/2007/04/slash\\_me\\_mash\\_me\\_but\\_please\\_sp.html](http://www.henryjenkins.org/2007/04/slash_me_mash_me_but_please_sp.html)
- Jenkins, H., Ford, S., & Green, J. (2013). *Spreadable media: Creating value and meaning in a networked culture*. New York: New York University Press.
- Joseph, M. (2002). *Against the romance of community*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Karatzogianni, A., & Kuntsman, S. (Eds.). (2012). *Digital cultures and the politics of emotion: Feelings, affect and technological change*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kuntsman, A. (2007). Belonging through violence: Flaming, erasure, and performativity in queer migrant community. In K. O'Riordan & D. J. Phillips (Eds.), *Queer online: Media, technology & sexuality* (pp. 101–120). New York: Peter Lang.
- Massumi, B. (2015). *The politics of affect*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Paasonen, S. (2011). *Carnal resonance: Affect and online pornography*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Paasonen, S. (2015). A midsummer's bonfire: Affective intensities of online debate. In K. Hillis, S. Paasonen, & M. Petit (Eds.), *Networked affect* (pp. 27–42). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Paasonen, S. (2018). Affect, data, manipulation and price in social media. *Distinktion: Journal of social theory* 19(2), 214–229.
- Paasonen, S., Hillis, K., & Petit, M. (2015). Networks of transmission: Intensity, sensation, value. In K. Hillis, S. Paasonen, & M. Petit (Eds.), *Networked affect* (pp. 1–24). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Papacharissi, Z. (2015). *Affective publics: Sentiment, technology, and politics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Papacharissi, Z. (2016). Affective publics and structures of storytelling: Sentiment, events and mediality. *Information, Communication & Society*, 19(3), 307–324.
- Petit, M. (2015). Digital disaffect: Teaching through screens. In K. Hillis, S. Paasonen, & M. Petit (Eds.), *Networked affect* (pp. 169–183). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Phillips, W. (2015). *This is why we can't have nice things: Mapping the relationship between online trolling and mainstream culture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Protevi, J. (2009). *Political affect: Connecting the social and the somatic*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

- Rheingold, H. (1993). *The virtual community: Finding connection in a computerized world*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Roberts, S.T. (2016). Commercial content moderation: Digital laborers' dirty work. In S. U. Noble & B. M. Tynes (Eds.), *The intersectional Internet: Race, sex, class, and culture online* (pp. 147–160). New York: Peter Lang.
- Sampson, T. (2012). *Virality: Contagion theory in the age of networks*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Senft, T.M. (2008). *CamGirls: Celebrity & community in the age of social networks*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Shifman, L. (2012). An anatomy of a YouTube meme. *New Media & Society*, 14(2), 187–203.
- Spinoza, B. (1992). *The ethics, treatise on the emendation of the intellect and selected letters*. In S. Feldman (Ed.), S. Shirley (Trans.). Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.
- Sundén, J. (2003). *Material virtualities: Approaching online textual embodiment*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Terranova, T. (2004). *Network culture: Politics of the information age*. London: Pluto Press.
- van Dijck, J. (2013). *The culture of connectivity: A critical history of social media*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Webster, J.G. (2014). *The marketplace of attention: How audiences take shape in a digital age*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Williams, R. (1977). *Marxism and literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.