



## The Shaping of Environmental Information in Social Media: Affordances and Technologies of Self-control

Jutta Haider

To cite this article: Jutta Haider (2016) The Shaping of Environmental Information in Social Media: Affordances and Technologies of Self-control, Environmental Communication, 10:4, 473-491, DOI: [10.1080/17524032.2014.993416](https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2014.993416)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2014.993416>

 View supplementary material 

 Published online: 21 Jan 2015.

 Submit your article to this journal 

 Article views: 1095

 View related articles 

 View Crossmark data 

 Citing articles: 1 View citing articles 

# The Shaping of Environmental Information in Social Media: Affordances and Technologies of Self-control

Jutta Haider

*This article studies environmental information as it circulates in social media, specifically in personal blogs and microblogs. It rests on a thematic analysis of a selection of Swedish language, personal, everyday life environment blogs active during 2011 and 2012 and the social media applications connected to these blogs. Gibson's concept of affordances and Foucault's notion of governmentality are brought together to examine how material and technological affordances of social media and the structures of governmentality work together to engender a type of information on environmentally friendly living that is rooted in the conditions of the Web, together with a view of society which is structured around choice and individual responsibility. The article argues that information is woven into the texture of the social on every level, including everyday life practices, and hence social media, as tools in such practices, contribute to shaping the way in which information on environmentally friendly living is articulated, shaped, and filled with meaning.*

**Keywords:** *environmental information; social media; blogs; governmentality; affordances; everyday life*

## Introduction

Information on how to live in a more environmentally friendly way as an individual or a family is produced and circulated online. This happens in various forms. For instance, government agencies, special interest organizations and occasionally also

---

Jutta Haider is Senior Lecturer in Information Studies, Department of Arts and Cultural Sciences, Lund University, Sweden. Correspondence to: Jutta Haider, Department of Arts and Cultural Sciences, Lund University, LUX, Helgonavägen 3, 223 62 Lund, Sweden. Email: [jutta.haider@kultur.lu.se](mailto:jutta.haider@kultur.lu.se)

businesses distribute information on certain topics or produce online campaigns to raise awareness of specific issues that are connected to, for instance, climate change or a common environmentally damaging behavior. This could be, for example, information on how to recycle, why to save energy and how to do it, or why to avoid a certain food that is unsustainably produced. There are also communities of interest that form around online forums for exchange of information (Merrick, 2012). Here, personal experience and advice are typically mixed with references to formal sources of information. Such forums also support the formation of identities around greener living and act as facilitators for “normalizing” such efforts (Merrick, 2012). Both these aspects—i.e., the formation of identity through connecting online and the normalizing of practices of environmentally friendly living (cf. Shove, 2003) including of information practices (Nathan, 2012)—have also appeared as significant in personal environmentally friendly living blogs and to a degree in other social media (Haider, 2012).

Importantly, how an issue is represented online has a bearing on the type of information that is available on specific issues and in turn forms the very issues at stake (Eklöf & Mager, 2013; Rogers, 2006, 2013). This is also the case in how we talk about the environment (Haider, 2014). Ultimately, given the significance of online platforms in all kinds of information-related activities, the possibilities for engagement, which they afford or impede, contribute to shaping how we frame a common understanding of those norms and values that ground environmentally friendly living and what environmental information looks like (cf. Yeo, 2014).

This article examines a specific sort of environmental information that circulates in social media and in particular in personal blogs and microblogs (Twitter). The main thrust of the article lies in developing an empirically grounded, theory-based argument outlining how the materiality of informing on what it means to live in a more environmentally friendly manner is socially and technically constituted—at the same time as it is an intrinsic part of information itself. Accordingly, the article’s purpose is twofold. To begin with, it aims to show how social media use contributes to forming what we perceive environmentally friendly living to be in Western consumer culture and how practices of control and self-control, as they are inscribed into these tools, conspire with the disciplinary regimes underlying practices of environmentally friendly living. Building on this argument the article then aims to delineate the, at times, ambiguous shape of the type of environmental information that emerges and is made available in this way. To do this, two theoretical concepts are brought together; first, Michel Foucault’s (1991) notion of governmentality and second the concept of affordances, originally proposed by James J. Gibson (1979). More specifically, the interest lies with selected material and technological affordances; that is, how specific tools, or their functions, afford opportunities for certain actions and, although not necessarily entirely excluding them, they make others less likely.

The next section presents an overview of the material and methods used in the study. This is followed by a brief account of the notion of governmentality and of some significant ways of conceptualizing expressions of the individualization of

environmental politics. Subsequently, a short description of the concept of affordances, specifically focusing on technical and functional affordances of online platforms, is presented. The article then moves on to examine the specificities of the type of environmental information that is in focus. In the process the concept of affordance is discussed and developed further, in close conjunction with a presentation of selected excerpts from the empirical material.

## **Methods and Material Collection**

The argument made in the present article rests on a thematic analysis of a selection of Swedish language, personal, everyday life environment blogs active during 2011 and 2012 and the social media applications, i.e., Twitter, Facebook, Instagram, YouTube, connected to these blogs. Constant comparative analysis was used to establish returning topics, which were analyzed by means of a theoretical reading (Kvale & Brinkman, 2009) drawing on the theoretical concepts introduced above as analytical devices for understanding and structuring.

Using a snowball approach starting from a now defunct, curated list of environment blogs in general (<http://miljobloggaktuellt.wordpress.com>), 46 Swedish language everyday life environment blogs that fulfilled certain criteria were selected (see Supplemental data).

The criteria were that the blogs had to be active, i.e., one blog post in the two preceding months and there had to exist a clear connection between the bloggers' everyday life and environmental issues. Material collection and analysis were inspired by the nonintrusive methods of observation as developed in observational netnography (Kozinets, 2010), which allow for immersion into an online site in order to comprehend its cultural meanings, relations, and values. I subscribed to the three most central blogs (see Supplemental data and [Figure 1](#)) as well as all Twitter accounts and Facebook profiles or pages that were connected to these blogs for a period of six months during 2012. This was established based on a link analysis using the IssueCrawler tool ([http://www.govcom.org/Issuecrawler\\_instructions.htm](http://www.govcom.org/Issuecrawler_instructions.htm)). I used these three blogs as entry points as well as anchor points for my investigation. I read the blogs' updates as they came in, I followed their links and suggestions and I browsed their archives and static pages, but I also connected to other profiles and subscribed to other pages, blogs, and profiles that were recommended and browsed their archives. I continued to read the other blogs and tweets that made up the original larger selection of blogs.

This combination of intense focus on a small number of central blogs together with ongoing, but more cursory, attention paid to connected blogs and to blogs further away from the center of the established network allowed me to compile a rich and varied collection of material. During the process of following, browsing, taking notes, and saving screenshots, I gained an understanding of the structure of a site of engagement, at times cohesive and at times fragmented. This site was co-constructed by me as the observer, as it unfolded through links, comments, fallouts, content of various sorts in different formats, campaigns, adverts, concerns, and the like while




Figure 1. Visualisation of the link network.

I was investigating it (boyd, 2009). After the first intense collection period was concluded, I kept following the various accounts throughout 2012—although less frequently than at the outset. This was done in order to obtain richer material and a more diverse picture, and I continued to take notes and collect material in the process. I returned to some of the blogs and Twitter feeds in 2013 in the process of writing. The material that found its way into this article in the form of direct quotes stems from blogs and from Twitter from 2008 to 2013. In addition, although I do not quote from it directly, observations from Facebook, Instagram, and YouTube also contributed to the development of the argument.

One theme<sup>1</sup> emerged as particularly consequential with regard to information on how to live in a more environmentally friendly way in a contemporary Western society, which is profoundly shaped by the conditions of today's Internet. Notions of control, and here specifically self-control in various guises, can be located as a returning topic in accounts of environmentally friendly living as it is represented in social media. Furthermore, and connected to the point made on self-control, environmentally friendly living is often explicitly reported as being done in the form of everyday life projects. This is expressed in ways that are formed by opportunities and restrictions that today's Internet, and specifically social media,

afford and is bounded by notions of what it means to live in an environmentally friendly manner within the settings of contemporary neoliberal societies. How this plays out more precisely, what it can look like in social media, and how to frame it is in focus after a brief theoretical scene-setting accounting first for governmentality and the politics of everyday life and second for the notion of affordances.

### **Everyday Life Politics as Material Self-control**

Increasingly, environmentally friendly living, in all its different forms, is discussed in the form of personal narratives in blogs, microblogs, and other social media (cf. Cooper, Green, Burningham, Evans, & Jackson, 2012; Graf, 2012; Haider, 2012; Yeo, 2014). Documenting personal decisions and depicting practices of greener living online, whether in blogs or other social media applications or in dedicated discussion forums, makes these often short narratives also part of an online ecology of information on environmentally friendly living, i.e., information on which behaviors are considered to be more environmentally friendly, how to enact us in social practices, and for which reasons. Furthermore, documenting one's activities online is a form of self-management and administration that also exposes them to others and to their scrutiny and possible control.

The notion of governmentality (Foucault, 1991), what Foucault described as the conduct of conduct or neoliberal society's deeply embedded self-disciplining regimes of control, can help to understand aspects of both environmentally friendly living (Paterson & Stripple, 2010) and social media (Sauter, 2014). Specifically, governmentality conceptualized as the "contact between the technologies of domination of others and those of the self" (Foucault, 1988, p. 19), where those "technologies of the self" incorporate components of self-examination and confession (Foucault, 1988), is a productive theoretical device to make sense of how statements on greener living, as they are made in social media, are part of normalizing systems that are the basis for the internalization of values, which shape discourse and material engagements. This framing also underlines how the task of administration stretches into the lives, bodies, and practices of individuals in a way that has implications for where responsibility is situated.

In such an understanding of neoliberalism as a regime built around market economy and the enterprise model as master categories that are instilled into how things are done on all levels and all the time (Foucault, 2008), policies, power, and meaning are viewed as dispersed and as acting not just on but also through individuals. It is in this sense a regime, a system of governing, which is at once totalizing and individualizing. With this in mind, the potential political meanings of greener living and of blogging or tweeting about it acquire additional complexity. Frameworks focusing on *governmentality* have been employed previously to understand the normative, controlling, and self-controlling character of environmentally friendly living, as not least the term *green governmentality* (Luke, 1999) attests. In an interesting, more recent, take, Paterson and Stripple (2010) specifically draw attention to the role of projects and projectlike activities that are devised to enable

people to “do their bit” to counter climate change and situate those within a governmentality framework. They use the many ways in which individuals are encouraged to account for their own carbon output to show how, in neoliberal market economies, power “operate(s) by shaping and producing individuals as particular types of subjects (managing their carbon budgets, etc.),” who manage and control their own doings according to internalized rules of government and marketplace. Specifically, they also argue for the need to take these mechanisms underpinning the curious relationship between freedom and control, as captured in the notion of governmentality, seriously in a policy context as well.

A number of different concepts have been put forward to capture the political character that underpins choices and everyday life practices, as they are relevant to environmentally friendly living. Environmentally friendly or greener living often relates to decisions with ethical dimensions, which are then embedded in quite mundane practices of everyday life (cf. Marres, 2012). For instance, not only fairly all-encompassing efforts like downshifting or attempts at self-sufficiency but also more modest changes related to consumption, transport, or food might be undertaken because of concerns regarding environmentally damaging consequences of global economic and sociopolitical structures. Yet these become tangible in ordinary practices of, for example, commuting, cooking, or shopping (cf. Shove & Spurling, 2013). Different framings of how to connect the private and the public spheres that meet here have been advanced over the years (cf. Lury, 2011, pp. 165–190). These are often framed in terms of a “lifestyle politics” (Bennett, 1998) and have tended to have a strong focus on consumption—as notions like “ethical consumption” (Lewis & Potter, 2011) or “political consumerism” (Micheletti, Follesdal, & Stolle, 2006) reflect—as well as on the significant role of individual choice in today’s society as, for instance, the term “individual collective action” (Micheletti, 2003) suggests. Most prominently Giddens’s (1991) *life politics* or Beck’s (1992) *subpolitics* together with his and Beck-Gernsheim’s notion of *individualization* (Beck & Beck-Gernsheim, 2002), have informed these understandings to varying degrees. They have in common that they put the spotlight on the ethics of the personal, which although consisting of seemingly individual acts and private decisions, function as ways of engaging with—and shaping—social matters. They foreground how private life and seemingly mundane everyday actions—such as, in the case at hand, not buying out of season, showering less often, eating vegetarian, recycling, and so forth—are socially structured and deeply political. To varying degrees they also work to make visible, and through this criticize, the transfer of the burden of risk to the individual in late modern society, as has been theorized extensively—not least by Beck and Beck-Gernsheim (2002). Recently, Noortje Marres (2012) introduced the notion of *material participation* in order to highlight *device-centered* aspects of participation. Writing in a tradition of Science and Technology Studies, but drawing on American political pragmatism (Marres, 2012, pp. 28–58), she investigates the role of objects in the performance of public participation, specifically as it matters for sustainable living. In contrast to most other accounts of the material and everyday life politics of

environmentally friendly living, she specifically also wants to consider the normative character of material forms of participations, yet without neglecting their liberating potential. It is interesting to remember that, aside from the materials written about in them and the devices needed to produce and consume them, blogs—and other social media tools—can themselves be conceptualized as such devices, devices that are enrolled in performances of participation when engaged to enact and reflect on practices of greener living.

### **Material/Technological Affordances and Environmentally Friendly Living**

Social media have certain characteristics that make them especially suitable for a type of individualized awareness-raising campaign that is increasingly common in the marketing of environmental living, as exemplified in prominent campaigns such as *Earth Hour*, *Meatfree Monday*, or *Buy-Nothing Day*. Two are especially important here. Both derive from the networked architecture of interconnected profiles and followers, which typically make up social media's underlying structure, in the form of a friends list or other similar features (e.g., Ellison & boyd, 2013). This supports, first, the so-called viral distribution of content/updates and, second, it makes it easy for users to produce and share content with their connections or followers. Having said that, different social media should not be thoughtlessly lumped together, clearly they also differ from each other in important aspects. Blogs, microblogs, social networks, or photo sharing, video sharing, or audio distribution sites, although similar in important ways, differ in many other ways, concerning what is technically possible and not least which activities or content are encouraged and rewarded. The latter is far from only a technical question and makes it quite apparent how here, social, cultural, and technical conditions collide and together have a bearing on information and meaning.

A theoretical tool for framing this collision of conditions comes with the concept of *affordances*, originally introduced by Gibson (1979). The notion of affordances brings to the fore how specific settings and also tools afford opportunities for certain actions and make others, not necessarily impossible, but less likely. Social media have certain characteristics that privilege some forms of content over others. For example, a limit of 140 characters, as Twitter has, is not conducive to longer texts. While these quantitative measures do not preclude social orientations of media use and qualitative content, they still give rise to a specific way of writing and interacting based on an exchange of shorter notes. Likewise, status updates, blog posts, Instagram images, and so forth—at least in order to be successful in the context they are intended for—need to observe certain rules.

Recently, Ronald Day (2011) suggested operationalizing the notion of affordances for the study of information use in order to escape technological and other determinisms, as well as cognitive approaches, while taking into consideration how social, cultural, and physical objects are codetermined (cf. Rivano Eckerdal, 2011). Exactly this codetermination has earlier been in focus for a branch of information behavior and specifically information literacy research. Here, the notion of

affordances has often been used within a wider sociotechnical framework to highlight how information literacies and behaviors are context and tool specific, yet constantly being renegotiated in social situations (e.g. Rivano Eckerdal, 2011; Sadler & Given, 2007; Tuominen, Savolainen, & Talja, 2005). It has even been drawn on within a practice theory framework in order to emphasize the nongeneric character of information literacies (e.g. Lloyd, 2006, 2010).

The idea of codetermination is fundamental to understanding affordances and is already present in Gibson's original description, where he writes:

actually, an affordance is neither an objective property nor a subjective property; or it is both if you like. An affordance cuts across the dichotomy of subjective-objective and helps us to understand its inadequacy. It is equally a fact of the environment and a fact of behavior. It is both physical and psychical, yet neither. An affordance points both ways, to the environment and the observer. (Gibson, 1979, p. 129)

I consider specifically framings of affordances in relation to information and communication tools (e.g., boyd, 2010; Conole & Dyke, 2004; Ellison & boyd, 2013; Fragoso, Rebs, & Barth, 2012; Graves, 2007; Hsieh, 2012; Hutchby, 2001; Huvila, 2009; Jordan, 2009; Wellman et al., 2003).

Ian Hutchby (2001, p. 206) underlines that “[t]echnologies for communication possess materiality not only in the physical sense but in the sense of their very conditions of possibility.” He develops another important point, which Tim Jordan (2009) also notices, namely the realization of affordances in the moment of an action:

In this sense the uses and the ‘values’ of things are not attached to them by interpretative procedures or internal representations, but are a material aspect of the thing as it is encountered in the course of action. We are able to perceive things in terms of their affordances, which in turn are properties of things; yet, those properties are not determinate or even finite, since they only emerge in the context of material encounters between actors and objects. (Hutchby, 2001, p. 27)

This emergence of affordances in the moment of action can be seen to occur as a part of everyday practices, as Jordan (2009), in his study on hacking and power, suggests. This resonates also with Nicole Ellison and danah boyd (2013), who in their definition of social network sites start primarily from technical features and affordances, yet highlight that “affordances that define a social network site have become increasingly fluid” (Ellison & boyd, 2013, p. 152) and, furthermore, the need to consider user practices and social implications of these practices.

In fact, the middle position between tool, use, social conditions, and implications, is what distinguishes the notion of affordances from simply talking about, for instance, technical features and what makes it so useful for the study of information. Not only codetermine blogs’ and microblogs’ specific conditions for communication, connecting, collaboration, and what can meaningfully be said, how, and to whom, but affordances themselves can only be made sense of when seen in action and when put in relation to each other.

### Project-Based Information and Environmentally Friendly Living

Social media, including blogs, microblogs, and social network sites, have become arenas for distributing information on how to live in a more environmentally friendly way and to raise awareness and have become sites for negotiations—fragmented and individualized—of what environmentally friendly living entails. Often, this takes the shape of campaigns for encouraging or discouraging certain behaviors akin to those we know from viral or social marketing of products or services that circulate in social media (Haider, 2012; Merrick, 2012; Corner & Randall, 2012; Yeo, 2014). Prominent examples of recent campaigns, which also made their appearance in my material, include *Earth Hour* (to save energy), the Swedish campaign *Anti Scampi* (to stop the selling and ultimately production of tiger shrimps), or *Buy-Nothing Day* (to curb overconsumption). Such a list could be made very long. What all these campaigns have in common is that they promote one simple action centered around material objects—switch-off the lights at a certain time, do not buy tiger shrimps and complain if you find them on menus, do not buy anything at all for one day—in order to change certain practices and more significantly in order to instigate behavior change (Corner & Randall, 2012). Although not undisputed in their role as policy tools for engaging the public in environmental issues (Corner & Randall, 2012), social marketing campaigns of this sort contribute to making a broader issue visible (cf. Marres, 2012; Paterson & Strippel, 2010)—in the above example, the energy crisis, unsustainable production of shrimps and food in general, and overconsumption/production—and they also function as points of reference to convene around for those attempting more environmentally friendly living.

The following tweet is illustrative of this:

@karinsenvironment<sup>2</sup> “is a satisfied coffee break champion. Baked brownies, invited friends and reported our coffee break to #Fairtradechallenge [link].” (karinsmiljo, 2012)

The tweet also included a link to an Instagram photo on another user’s account, showing a vegan brownie as the accompanying text explains. *Fairtrade Challenge* is part of an awareness-raising campaign by the organization behind the *Fairtrade* certificate. People are encouraged to organize a coffee break with *Fairtrade*-labeled products and to announce it on a special web site, where it is then documented and made accessible together with all other coffee breaks through a Google maps interface (<http://fairtradechallenge.se>) at the same time as the hashtag #Fairtradechallenge collects tweets on the various coffee break events. The hash tag (#) used for organizing tweets, and increasingly also other social media expressions, is especially suited for this type of engagement. It has the potential to cross-connect content and profiles or people and weave them into loose communities of interest and, at least in principal, it also makes content easier to find. Now campaign names include the # from the start, as, for instance, #byttilleko (#changetoorganic) by the Swedish Society for Nature Conservation.

Interestingly, it does not stop with projects tied to campaigns, but people also design their own projects based on challenges that suit their specific situations. They

either use a campaign as a ready-made template to build on, draw inspiration from each other, or start an entirely new project from scratch (Haider, 2012). Popular examples among Swedish environment bloggers include *in-and-out lists* to control one's own consumption, *buy-nothing periods* of varying length, and variations of *Meatfree Monday*. For instance, in one blog we can read the following:

Yes this week's veggie report is nothing to be proud of. And this is I think also somewhat of the meaning with this entry, or – ahem not that there was a shortage of vegetarian food. There is already a category on this topic and there we have Meatfree Monday, but I have Harvest Monday instead ... and I think I would like to eat vegetarian several times a week ... so it must be Veggie Report as a category instead with a focus on getting more vegetarian meals during the week. (Bondjantan, 2012)

The blogger, *Farmer Lass*, in fact has a number of different theme days besides Harvest Monday around which the blog and everyday life are structured. Categories that can be accessed in the navigation bar include “Wednesday: Reduce. Reuse. Recycle”; “Friday: Health and Well-Being,” and “Sunday: Veggie Report.”

Regardless of whether the project is ready-made and connected to a social marketing campaign, as the Fairtrade Challenge above, or home-made as in the latter example, information on a particular issue is tightly connected with—or even located in—certain material practices (Hobson, 2006; Marres, 2012). At the same time, it is anchored in a social context that makes it meaningful and a technical context that makes it easy to share, comment on, archive, search, and access.

### Traversable Connections

I want to draw attention to one particular characteristic of many social media applications that was already introduced above and that we can now reexamine in the light of the notion of affordance, and the example above. The possibility to compile lists of contacts, friends, followers, profiles, and the like and to make them—and the connections between them—public to varying degrees, constitutes not just the most characteristic technical feature that is typically used as a common denominator for definitions of social network sites (boyd & Ellison, 2007; Ellison & boyd, 2013), and social media more broadly, but it can also be conceptualized as an affordance in the sense introduced above. Blogs are a special case since, for one thing, blog rolls, followers, and other links are optional in them and this feature is not usually considered the most defining characteristic (Garden, 2012). Yet, as Ellison and boyd (2013, pp. 157–158) also underline, with the introduction of template-based blog services early on blogs became, in fact, a precursor of what is now known as social media and even social network sites, precisely because of incorporating traversable and visible connections in the form of blog rolls and other followers. Hence, both microblogs and blogs afford traversable connections with other profiles, either in the same or on another platform.

For instance, on the blog tellingly called “It’s easy being green” (*English in original*) by now over two years’ worth of weekly in-and-out lists have been collected.

The very first in-and-out list dates from November 2010 and it is introduced with a short text:

Now I nick a really good idea from Voluntary Simplicity [link to another blog] and hereby start listing the week's IN:OUT. That is to say – what has left the flat and what has come into it.... Shame that I start with this the same week that I broke my shopping stop!;-) The list does not apply to consumables. (Pernilla/ekoenkelt, 2010)

One year and 52 lists later the blogger can proudly announce a negative result:

IN:OUT for one year results in 480 belongings OUT and 320 belongings IN. I see a clear and distinct room for improvement! I am a bit disappointed because the last half year was worse than the one before, but enough complaining – an excellent chance for consuming even less?" (Pernilla/ekoenkelt, 2011)

The post received 20 comments by followers—including congratulations, encouragement, and also questions by other bloggers who ask for advice on how to structure their own in-and-out list projects, or other projects for controlling consumption. We can follow their profile links and find new variations of the project as it travels between blogs. Usually it is manifested in the form of a tag or a category in the menu bar and each list contains more comments by followers congratulating, encouraging, sharing advice, and experiences.

This leads to a further point that is relevant for the present material, and that is, how different social media applications tie into each other. Ellison and boyd (2013) talk about an increasing fluidity of affordances. They are not specific about it, but it seems to me that this also needs to be understood in the light of how social network sites and other social media become increasingly mashed-up and interconnected. Radically formulated, this makes them each other's affordances—at times. That is to say, connections traverse not just to other profiles, e.g., Twitter account to Twitter account and blog to blog, but also to other platforms, e.g., Twitter to blog, Facebook to Instagram, and so forth. Content and connections are exchanged across platforms and given new meaning within new sets of different ranges of affordances. Although problematic in its literal likening of social media spaces with publics (cf. Fuchs, 2014), danah boyd's (2010) notion of *networked publics* is nonetheless useful here in that it locates the dynamics of technology in its affordances: "Networked publics' affordances do not dictate participants' behavior, but they do configure the environment in a way that shapes participants' engagement" (boyd, 2010, p. 39).

### Challenges and Self-control

Connections with other profiles and users afford two things that are relevant for us—first, the possibility to share specific types of content and, second, visibility or publicness (cf. Batemen, Pike, & Butler, 2010; Baym & boyd, 2012). These affordances are realized in everyday practices that actualize the possibilities and restrictions of tools in certain ways. One of the ways relates, I suggest, to control and specifically also to self-control. This chimes with the overview of affordances of ICTs for learning by Conole and Dyke (2004, p. 120), where they include possibilities for surveillance

and control, grounded in a disciplinary perspective on control. In contrast, in order to get to grips with the role of social media for people's writing about the practicalities of environmentally friendly living, the study at hand shifts the focus to self-control and governmentality and sees those as afforded by the networked visibility of social media.

"I suddenly felt it was a very long time ago that I challenged myself to reduce my environmental impact. Tips, anyone? #swgreen" (karinsmiljo, 2012, August 22) asks one blogger in her Twitter account. In her tweet she links to a longer blog post entitled "To constantly challenge oneself" (Karin, 2012, August 22), where she develops the question somewhat and provides a link to a list of what she already does for the environment, called *My Environmental Choices* (Karin, n.d.). Here you find things like eating vegan, buying fewer clothes, bicycling to work, avoiding flying, recycling, buying secondhand, avoiding chemical additives in beauty products, only showering every other day, using organic cat litter, and so forth. She also questions the idea that it is difficult to live environmentally friendly in the way she does and asks readers to chime in with advice on how to actually challenge herself. On her blog she is advised to probably take even fewer showers and to recycle better and more by joining a particular recycling scheme which the commentator also works for. A Twitter follower of hers, after first writing some words of encouragement, recommends her to try a buy-nothing period.

What is visible here is, first, how social media tools are integrated with each other and, second, how they afford a certain type of engagement with each other, with the self, and with the way in which we frame environmentally friendly living. It is presented as being broken down into tasks, which can then be complemented by other tasks in the form of miniprojects or challenges that can be easily communicated in a tweet or a blog comment, such as—in the above example—buy-nothing periods or joining a recycling scheme. What's more, they circulate and gain new meaning in different settings. For instance, years after the first comment was posted, one blog reader, posting under the name *Green Simplicity*, remarks on the above-mentioned post "My Environmental Challenges": "I look for blogs with eco-inspiration and was happy when I finally found your blog" (Grön enkelhet, 2013). These public accounts of consciously challenging oneself to becoming better in diminishing one's "environmental impact" that explicitly want to engage others, make the political dimensions of this way of living more environmentally friendly quite palpable. In order to further highlight the synergies between the individualizing technologies of the self and the individualizing affordances of social media, the next section examines how these types of material and informational engagements can be described through the lens of governmentality and the connected notion of self-formation.

In the light of this, it is interesting to return to the notion of environmentally friendly living as an individual challenge. As one blogger writes:

The environmental challenge is simple on paper and difficult in practice. It started when JT got in touch because he felt that it was time we pulled ourselves together. I guess as a new father he had started feeling responsible for the future. His idea was simple: One environmental improvement per week. But how do you make one

improvement each week if you already cycle to work, sort all your garbage and have already exchanged all the light bulbs for energy saving ones? Still, I accepted the challenge. Competition wasn't part of the idea. Just to spur each other on and to constantly improve. But the first week I lost by miles. (Miljötmaningen, 2008)

This is the first entry in a blog tellingly called “The Environmental Challenge” and where over several years, although with at times several months long breaks, a blogger describes his different attempts (and failures) to improve himself and his lifestyle in a way that is considered environmentally friendly. Campaign-specific projects feature in the blog as do various impact counters or self-tests and even others who take him up on the challenge.

Communication and information tools are complicit in shaping and controlling subjects in this way, as not least Foucault himself develops (e.g., Foucault, 2002). In recent decades this has become almost overly visible in television shows, including reality TV, docu-soaps, or talk shows with the outspoken aim to better people and fix their lives—in the form of improving, for instance, their bodies, homes, pets, or children (e.g. Oulette & Hay, 2008), at times even in the form of eco-makeover programs (Craig, 2010). In Web-based social media, which afford interconnected profiles and user-generated content and which are deeply embedded in the very fabric of everyday life, similar mechanisms can be seen at work from yet a new angle. As Theresa Sauter (2014, p. 829) emphasizes in a study of Facebook, the “techno-social hybridity of modern western societies shapes practices of self-formation,” yet as she also outlines in some detail, this is anchored in a long tradition of self-writing and self-control.

Sauter develops an understanding of how today's technologized practice of self-writing, as it exists in Facebook and other social media, is deeply rooted in a history of self-writing that goes back to antiquity, but how it is also specific to the ways in which in today's neoliberal society people are expected to control their own conduct, to improve and work on themselves, and to also perform their accomplishments and failures in public according to internalized rules. This perspective shifts the focus from the staging of identities to the formation of selves on social network sites (Sauter, 2014, p. 825). Hence,

[a]nalyzing online self-writing can indicate what some modern western social norms are and how they are being followed and transgressed. The public availability of these self-inscriptions provides real-time insights into how people try to make sense of their lives and guide their conduct. (Sauter, 2014, p. 825)

In addition, I suggest these “real-time insights,” as Sauter calls them, can also be seen as information on, in the case at hand, environmentally friendly living—more specifically as depictions of possible ways of undertaking environmentally friendly living, shaped also by the affordances of tools with which they are produced and distributed.

Therefore, it is not surprising that the reason to start greener living blogs or to report on such choices in other social media is often connected to displaying these

choices and self-selected restrictions. The following example shows and also problematizes this:

[The energy] just doesn't suffice to move forward any environmental positions. We buy organic, recycle and avoid using the car just like always, but we never look outside the box and we trip over some of our good intentions. The blog is a representation of my bad conscience. Bad conscience for plastic party presents, fast food, electricity consumption. A bit like it probably is for most people – and a part of what was the reason for me to start this blog. But is this something to read about?" (Eva, 2011)

The blog has the telling name "To live moderately. An entirely normal family converts to a life that puts a little less strain on our common resources." Just the name is a clear indication of how understandings of the need for self-control form the discourse of environmentally friendly living and the everyday lives of people, as well as how it is governed by notions of normality and moderation. The blog post reflects on such restrictions and, in its course, it also brings in the reader, the observer, as an active element, which also shapes the process of self-writing. As has been obvious throughout, publicness—however it might actually be realized in each individual case of use—is an important opportunity afforded by social media built into its basic functioning (cf. Bateman et al., 2010). The role of a public, imagined or not, for the process of self-formation as environmentally friendly citizens and ultimately of perpetuation and reproduction of control, comes into relief in this short reflection. Not surprisingly, the followers' comments are encouraging. Still, after two further blog posts, the blog ceases to be updated. Yet it remains online. It appears in blog rolls and it remains searchable. As we have seen in earlier examples, these blogs are deliberately used as sources of inspiration—in other words information, judged to be relevant and meaningful—on how to actually live in a more environmentally friendly way and, in due course, on what it is to be an environmentally friendly person.

Furthermore, although the underlying rationale of most of the set tasks and miniprojects people write about and reflect on is individualistic, we also see that it happens in networks of shared interest and of publicness—which can be seen as a form of online civic engagement. Specifically, this is the case, I suggest, when prefabricated social marketing campaigns are hacked and turned into new miniprojects that travel between networked profiles and gain new meaning through constant renegotiation, while working as points of reference for those connected and engaged.

## Conclusions

Environmentally friendly living, as documented online, relates to ethical decisions that play out in practices relating to one's own body, to the family, to living spaces; often in the form of consumption and related to other media, products, and "ready-made" projects and challenges. Buy-nothing periods, avoiding additives, not using anything made of plastic, or keeping in-and-out lists to control consumption are common, as are set miniprojects that relate to various organizations' social marketing

campaigns. The neoliberal ideal of the enterprising citizen governing her own conduct (Foucault, 2008; Gordon, 1991) is articulated and in fact also challenged in blogs and other social media, which privilege marketing-inspired challenges, campaigns, and projects. Social media and, in particular, blogs, Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter, have become important tools in this—often criticized (cf. Corner & Randall, 2012)—individualization and self-administration of greener living, not least since this is often a main arena where environmentally friendly living and its administration become visible, is documented, and circulates. Yet making visible through documentation means also engaging in and connecting to a larger setting, as well as tangible participation in the shaping and reproduction and also contesting of discourse on what it means to live in more (or less) environmentally friendly ways. Specifically, this has implications for the type of information that is available on greener living, which becomes even more acute when coupled with the affordances of social media.

For the purpose of highlighting some of the ways in which this happens the article provides glimpses of how people in Sweden articulate and make sense of their efforts to live more environmentally friendly lives in consumer culture and how they self-manage their conduct for this goal. Expressions of self-control regarding environmentally friendly living practices in relation to social media use are traced and connected to the role of an individualized politics of the self, concerning an issue of global relevance, as environmental destruction is. Writing and posting pictures online expose both their own and their families' lives to public, or at least semi-public, scrutiny, frequently with the explicit aim of motivating and controlling themselves. In a terminology focusing on governmentality, this can be framed, as I show, as an individualized politics of the self (cf. Paterson & Strippel, 2010), as a form of *conduct of conduct*. Here, social media act as literal technologies of self-control and function as tools for keeping track of the shaping of bodies, houses, children, gardens, and other components of everyday life in ways that suit images of an environmentally friendly life. Specifically, the way in which projects as individual acts of choosing to make a difference are performed publicly in social media is interesting and can only be understood if we also consider aspects of control—and most of all self-control—that are, I argue, inscribed into the workings of these tools.

The article brings into sharp relief how material and technological affordances and the structures of governmentality work to engender a certain type of information on environmentally friendly living that is deeply rooted in the conditions of the Web and also in a neoliberal view of society structured around choice and individual responsibility. If we think of information as woven into the texture of the social on every level, including everyday life practices, then the tools used in such practices—for instance, social media—shape the way in which information on environmentally friendly living is articulated, shaped, and made meaningful. Hence, at a more abstract level what comes into focus more clearly is how the materiality of informing is first social and second an intrinsic part of information.

## Acknowledgments

The author thanks the anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments that helped to greatly improve this article. The author is also grateful to the members of the research group “Information practices: Communication, Culture and Society” for their helpful comments.

## Supplemental Data

Supplemental data for this article can be accessed at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2014.993416>

## Notes

1. For another more quantitative analysis of the same material, see Haider (2014), and for overlapping material, see Haider (2012).
2. All quotes are translated by the author. Since the blogs’ names and Twitter handles are informative in themselves even these are translated into English.

## References

- Bateman, P. J., Pike, J. C., & Butler, B. S. (2010). To disclose or not: Publicness in social networking sites. *Information, Technology & People*, 24(1), 78–100.
- Baym, N. K., & boyd, d. (2012). Socially mediated publicness: An introduction. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 56(3), 320–329. doi:10.1080/08838151.2012.705200
- Beck, U. (1992). *Risk society: Towards a new modernity*. London: Sage.
- Beck, U., & Beck-Gernsheim, E. (2002). *Individualization: Institutionalized individualism and its social and political consequences*. London: Sage
- Bennett, W. L. (1998). The uncivic culture: Communication, identity, and the rise of lifestyle politics. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 31(4), 741–761.
- Bondjantan (2012, August 12). *Veckans vegorapport* [The week’s veggie report]. *Bondjantan*. Retrieved from <http://bondjantan.blogspot.se/2012/08/veckans-vegorapport.html>
- boyd, d. (2009). A response to Christine Hine (Defining project boundaries). In A. Markham & N. K. Baym (Eds.), *Internet inquiry: Conversations about method* (pp. 26–32). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- boyd, d. (2010). Social network sites as networked publics: Affordances, dynamics and implications. In Z. A. Papacharissi (Ed.), *A Networked self: Identity, community, and culture on social network sites* (pp. 39–58) New York: Routledge.
- boyd, d., & Ellison, N. (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, 13(1), 210–230. doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2007.00393.x
- Conole, G., & Dyke, M. (2004). What are the affordances of information and communication technologies? *Association for Learning Technology Journal*, 12(2), 113–124. doi:10.1016/S0048-7333(99)00016-5
- Cooper, G., Green, N., Burningham, K., Evans, D., & Jackson, T. (2012). Unravelling the threads: Discourses of sustainability and consumption in an online forum. *Environmental Communication*, 6(1), 101–118.
- Corner, A., & Randall, A. (2012). Selling climate change? The limitations of social marketing as a strategy for climate change public engagement. *Global Environmental Change*, 21, 1005–1014. doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.05.002
- Craig, G. (2010). Everyday epiphanies: Environmental networks in eco-makeover lifestyle television. *Environmental Communication*, 4(2), 172–189.

- Day, R. E. (2011). Death of the user: Reconceptualizing subjects, objects, and their relations. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 62(1), 78–88. doi:10.1002/asi.21422
- Eklöf, J., & Mager, A. (2013). Technoscientific promotion and biofuel policy: How the press and search engines stage the biofuel controversy. *Media, Culture & Society*, 35, 454–471.
- Ellison, N., & boyd, d. (2013). Sociality through social network sites. In W. H. Dutton (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of internet studies* (pp. 151–169). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eva (2011, March 15). *Min blogg och jag*. [My blog and I]. *Att leva lagom: En alldeles vanlig familj ställer om till ett liv som sliter lite mindre på våra gemensama resurser*. Retrieved from <http://attleva.lagom.blogspot.se/2011/03/velar.html>
- Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the self. In M. Foucault, L. H. Martin, H. Gutman, & P. H. Hutton (Eds.), *Technologies of the self. A seminar with Michel Foucault* (pp. 16–49). Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality. With two lectures and an interview with Michel Foucault* (pp. 87–104). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, M. (2002). The subject and power. In M. Foucault (Ed.), *Power: Essential works of Foucault 1954–1984* (pp. 326–348). London: Penguin.
- Foucault, M. (2008). *The birth of biopolitics. Lectures at the Collège de France 1978–1979* (edited by Michel Senellart). Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fragoso, S., Rebs, R. R., & Barth, D. L. (2012). Interface affordances and social practices in online communication systems. In G. Tortora, S. Levialdi, & M. Tucci (Eds.), *Proceedings of the international working conference on advanced visual interfaces (AVI '12)* (pp. 50–57). New York: ACM. doi:10.1145/2254556.2254569
- Fuchs, C. (2014). *Social media: A critical introduction*. London: Sage.
- Garden, M. (2012). Defining blog: A fool's errand or a necessary undertaking. *Journalism*, 13, 483–499. doi:10.1177/1464884911421700
- Gibson, J. J. (1979). *The ecological approach to visual perception*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Gordon, C. (1991). Governmental rationality. An introduction. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality with two lectures and an interview with Michel Foucault* (pp. 1–51) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Graf, H. (2012). Examining garden blogs as communication systems. *International Journal of Communication*, 6, 2758–2779.
- Graves, L. (2007). The affordances of blogging: A case study in culture and technological effects. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 31(4), 331–346. doi:10.1177/0196859907305446
- Grön enkelhet (2013, August 13). Comment on: Karin (n.d.). *Mina miljöval* [My environmental choices]. *Karins miljöblogg*. Retrieved from <http://www.karinsmiljoblogg.com/p/mina-miljoval.html>
- Haider, J. (2012). Interrupting practices that want to matter: The making, shaping and reproduction of environmental information online. *Journal of Documentation*, 68, 639–658. doi:10.1108/00220411211256012
- Haider, J. (2014). Taking the environment online: Issue and link networks surrounding personal green living blogs. *Online Information Review*, 38(2), 248–264. doi:10.1108/OIR-03-2013-0052
- Hobson, K. (2006). Bins, bulbs, and shower timers: On the 'techno-ethics' of sustainable living. *Ethics, Place and Environment*, 9(3), 317–336. doi:10.1080/13668790600902375
- Hsieh, Y. P. (2012). Online social networking skills: The social affordances approach to digital inequality. *First Monday*, 17 (4). Retrieved from <http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/3893/3192>

- Hutchby, I. (2001). *Conversation and technology: From the telephone to the Internet*. London: Polity.
- Huvila, I. (2009). Ecological framework of information interactions and information infrastructures. *Journal of Information Science*, 35, 695–708. doi:10.1177/0165551509336705
- Jordan, T. (2009). Hacking and power: Social and technological determinism in the digital age. *First Monday*, 14(7). Retrieved from: <http://firstmonday.org/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/2417/2240>
- Karin (n.d.). *Mina miljöval* [My environmental choices]. *Karins miljöblogg*. Retrieved from <http://www.karinsmiljoblogg.com/p/mina-miljoval.html>
- Karin (2012, August 22). *Att ständigt utmana sig själv*. *Karins miljöblogg*. Retrieved from <http://www.karinsmiljoblogg.com/2012/08/att-standigt-utmana-sig.html>
- karinsmiljo (2012, August 22). *Kände plötsligt att det var länge sedan jag utmanade mig själv att minska min miljöpåverkan. Tips, någon? #swgreen* <http://www.karinsmiljoblogg.com/2012/08/att-standigt-utmana-sig.html?spref=tw>. Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/Karinsmiljo/status/238313655521910784>
- karinsmiljo (2012, October 18). *Är nöjd fikamästare. Bakat brownies, bjudit kompisarna och rapporterat vår fikapaus till #Fairtradechallenge*. <http://instagr.am/p/Q71tb3JIPd/> [Twitter post]. Retrieved from <https://twitter.com/Karinsmiljo/status/258928823628881922>
- Kozinets, R. V. (2010). *Netnography: Doing ethnographic research online*. London: Sage.
- Kvale, S., & Brinkman, S. (2009). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2nd edition). Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Lewis, T., & Potter, E. (Eds.) (2011). *Ethical consumption: A critical introduction*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Lloyd, A. (2006). Information literacy landscapes: An emerging picture. *Journal of Documentation*, 62, 570–583. doi:10.1108/00220410610688723
- Lloyd, A. (2010). Framing information literacy as information practice: Site ontology and practice theory. *Journal of Documentation*, 66(2), 245–258. doi:10.1108/00220411011023643
- Luke, T. (1999). Environmentalism as green governmentality. In E. Darier (Ed.), *Discourses of the environment* (pp. 121–151). Malden, PA: Blackwell.
- Lury, C. (2011). *Consumer culture* (2nd ed). Cambridge: Polity.
- Marres, N. (2012). *Material participation: Technology, the environment and everyday publics*. Houndsmill, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Merrick, H. (2012). Promoting sustainability and simple living online and off-line: An Australian case study. *First Monday*, 17(12), Retrieved from <http://www.firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/viewArticle/4234/3378>
- Micheletti, M. (2003). *Political virtue and shopping*. New York: Palgrave.
- Micheletti, M., Follesdal, A., & Stolle, D. (Eds.) (2006). *Politics, products, and markets: Exploring political consumerism past and present*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Miljöutmaningen (2008, November 23). *Miljöutmaningen [Environmental challenge]. Miljöutmaningen: Små steg mot en hållbar livstil*. Retrieved from <http://www.miljoutmaningen.se/?m=200811&paged=2>
- Nathan, L. P. (2012). Sustainable information practice: An ethnographic investigation. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 63, 2254–2268. doi:10.1002/asi.22726
- Oulette, L., & Hay, J. (2008). Makeover television, governmentality and the good citizen. *Continuum: Journal of Media and Cultural Studies*, 22, 471–484. doi:10.1080/10304310801982930
- Paterson, M., & Strippel, J. (2010). My Space: governing individuals' carbon emissions. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 28(2), 341–362. doi:10.1068/d4109
- Pernilla/ekoenkelt (2010, November 7). *Veckans IN:UT [The week's IN:OUT]. It's easy being green*. Retrieved from <http://ekoenkelt.wordpress.com/2010/11/07/veckans-inut>

- Pernilla/ekoenkelt (2011, October 30). *Ett halvår till av IN:UT* [Another half a year of IN:OUT]. *It's easy being green*. Retrieved from <http://ekoenkelt.wordpress.com/2011/10/30/ett-halvar-till-av-inut>
- Rivano Eckerdal, J. (2011). Young women choosing contraceptives: Stories about information literacy practices related to evaluation and use of information sources. *Dansk bibliotksforskning*, 7(2/3), 19–31.
- Rogers, R. (2006). *Information politics on the web*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Rogers, R. (2013). *Digital methods*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Sadler, E., & Given, L. M. (2007). Affordance theory: A framework for graduate students' information behavior. *Journal of Documentation*, 63(1), 115–141. doi:10.1108/00220410710723911
- Sauter, T. (2014). 'What's on your mind?' Writing on Facebook as a tool for self-formation. *New Media & Society*, 16, 823–839. doi:10.1177/1461444813495160
- Shove, E. (2003). *Comfort, cleanliness and convenience: The social organization of normality*. Oxford: Berg.
- Shove, E., & Spurling, N. (Eds.) (2013). *Sustainable practices: Social theory and climate change*. London: Routledge.
- Tuominen, K., Savolainen, R., & Talja, S. (2005). Information literacy as a sociotechnical practice. *Library Quarterly*, 75(3), 329–345. doi:10.1086/497311
- Wellman, B., Quan Haase, A., Boase, J., Chen, W., Hampton, K., Diaz, I., & Miyata, K. (2003). The social affordances of the Internet for networked individualism. *Journal of Computer Mediated Communication*, 8(3). doi:10.1111/j.1083-6101.2003.tb00216.x
- Yeo, T. E. D. (2014). Negotiating virtue and vice: Articulations of lay conceptions of health and sustainability in social media conversations around natural beverages. *Environmental Communication*, 8(1), 39–57. doi:10.1080/17524032.2013.849276