ProD
Critical Readings across Disciplines

Alternative Media: Theories, Conceptual Frameworks, and Critical Perspectives

Yam Bahadur Dura (ORCID)

Department of Journalism, Madan Bhandari Memorial College

Article Info.	Abstract
	This thematic paper critically examines the diverse theoretical frameworks and conceptualizations of alternative media, tracing its evolution from traditional forms to contemporary digital platforms. Drawing on critical communication studies, social movement theory, participatory media approaches, and radical media theories, it explores how scholars such as John Downing, Clemencia Rodríguez, and Chris Atton define alternative media in relation to power structures, media activism, participatory communication, and community engagement. By analyzing these key theoretical perspectives, this paper highlights the distinct characteristics that differentiate alternative media from its mainstream counterparts, considering factors such as ownership, content, distribution, and audience engagement. The findings emphasize the evolving nature of alternative media in the digital era, where decentralized platforms challenge mainstream narratives and create new spaces for grassroots communication. They also underscore the need for further research on the sustainability and impact of alternative media in contemporary society, particularly with the growing demand for more academic discourse on this topic in Nepal. *Keywords*: alternative media, participatory communication, radical media, media activism, counter-hegemony

Introduction

Alternative media have been defined in various ways by scholars and practitioners across different time periods and contexts. In general, alternative media differ from established or dominant forms of media in terms of content, production, or distribution systems. They operate outside of, or challenge, mainstream, corporate, and state-run media structures. Demir (2023) defines alternative media as non-corporate, non-hierarchical, and non-profit. Atton (2002) notes that alternative media outlets often emphasize grassroots participation, marginalized voices, and non-commercial perspectives, focusing on promoting social, political, or cultural change.

Alternative media are rooted in participatory, community-driven approaches to media production and consumption, emphasizing inclusivity, democratic engagement, and resistance against corporate and state-controlled media structures (McChesney, 2007). Downing (2001) defines alternative media as communication practices that differ from dominant, mainstream media forms, emphasizing grassroots participation, localized content, and cultural relevance. Kenix (2011) argues that alternative media can be distinguished by its participatory production processes, its innovative content and form, its independence from commercial interests, and its commitment to social change.

Atton and Hamilton (2008) observe that alternative media organizations often operate with horizontal structures, rely on volunteer labor, practice collective decision-making, and maintain editorial independence through non-commercial funding models. Couldry & Curran (2003) claim that alternative media aim to create spaces for a more diverse and inclusive communication environment. Fuchs (2010a) believes that alternative media seek to empower local communities, advocate for underrepresented groups, and foster participatory media practices.

Alternative media have several key characteristics: They typically function outside corporate media conglomerates (Kenix, 2011), focus on perspectives and voices traditionally underrepresented in mainstream media (Rodriguez, 2001), utilize participatory production processes that blur the line between media producers and consumers (Lievrouw, 2011), and maintain a critical stance toward power structures and dominant societal narratives (Fuchs, 2010b).

The history of alternative media dates back to early forms of dissenting publications, such as 16th- and 17th-century pamphlets used to challenge religious and political authorities in Europe (Eisenstein, 1979). During the 18th and 19th centuries, underground presses became crucial to revolutionary movements, including the American and French Revolutions, offering platforms for radical ideas and opposition to state-controlled media (Habermas, 1989). Similarly, alternative media have a rich history rooted in the countercultural movements of the 20th century, emerging as a response to the dominance of mainstream, corporate-controlled media.

In the 20th century, alternative media further expanded with labor presses, feminist publications, and anti-colonial journalism (Downing, 2001). With the advent of digital technology in the late 20th and early 21st centuries, alternative media increasingly shifted to online platforms, including independent news websites, blogs, and social media. According to Atton (2002) and Fuchs (2010b), the digital shift has enabled decentralized and participatory journalism on a global scale, further empowering grassroots movements to challenge state and corporate power.

Initially, alternative media served as a form of resistance during the 1960s and 1970s, driven by social movements such as civil rights activism, anti-war protests, and the rise of feminist and environmental movements (Downing, 2001). This period also saw the emergence of countercultural media like underground radio stations and radical magazines, which, according to Atton (2002), played a significant role in supporting civil rights, anti-war, and feminist efforts. Today, alternative media continue to evolve in various forms and contexts. Fenton (2008) notes that alternative media are undergoing transformations, serving as a vital tool for political resistance, cultural expression, and social change while fostering democratic engagement in an increasingly globalized and media-saturated world.

In the context of Nepal, alternative media appear in various forms, including but not limited to letters, audio towers, *Doko Radio*—an underground mobile transmitter transported in a bamboo basket used during the Maoist insurgency— community radio, the *Katuwal* tradition, and *Karkha*—eventful songs sung by the *Gandarbhas*, a singing community. Similarly, pamphlets, wall posters, letters, wall magazines, and, more recently, social media are additional forms of alternative media.

Alternative media have become integrals of daily life, existing alongside mainstream media. However, significant data on social media users in Nepal remains unavailable. According to Pew Research Center (2024) survey, 54% of American adults report occasionally obtaining news from social media—a prominent form of alternative media. Despite its growing influence, alternative media have yet to be fully incorporated into mainstream discourse in Nepal. This paper seeks to contribute to the mainstreaming of alternative media by analyzing its key concepts and theoretical foundations.

The Statement of the Problem

Various forms of alternative media— such as community radio, *Katuwal*, pamphlets, social media, and oral traditions— are in practice in Nepal. Different alternative media outlets were utilized across various socio-political movements, from opposition to the Rana rulers to the armed conflict (1996–2006). However, the landscape of alternative media in Nepal remains understudied and under-discussed despite its significant role in the country's evolving media ecosystem. Likewise, there is insufficient academic documentation and analysis regarding how these alternative media platforms function, their impact on social discourse, and their relationship with mainstream media institutions. Academic discourse has largely neglected these media forms.

This research gap limits our understanding of Nepal's media pluralism and the democratization of information in the Nepali context. For this reason, this paper aims to highlight the philosophical foundations, academic significance, and societal roles of alternative media. Additionally, it seeks to open avenues for broader public discourse.

Research Questions

- How are alternative media defined, and what are their underlying philosophical foundations?
- In what ways do alternative media and mainstream media differ, and where do their practices and purposes converge?

Research Objectives

The main objectives of the paper are to—

- explore the various definitions and examine the philosophical foundations that underpin the concept and practice of alternative media within academic and practical contexts.
- identify and evaluate the key differences between alternative media and mainstream media in terms of structure, content, purpose, and audience engagement, while also investigating areas of convergence

and interaction between these media forms, particularly in their roles within public discourse and democratic communication.

Methodology

This thematic paper employs a qualitative interpretive approach through a comprehensive desk review to examine the philosophical underpinnings of literatures on alternative media. In this course, ideas are borrowed from Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer's "Culture Industry," Antonio Gramsci's "Theory of Hegemony," Edward Herman & Noam Chomsky's "Propaganda Model," Paulo Freire's "Participatory Communication," John Downing's "Radical Media," Denis McQuail's "Democratic Participatory Theory," Nancy Fraser's concept of "Subaltern Counterpublics" and other relevant theories to see the significance and theoretical grounds of alternative media.

Philosophical Foundations

The philosophical foundations of alternative media are rooted in critical theory, participatory communication, and the democratization of media. The discussion on alternative media is grounded in various critical and postmodern theories that critique how dominant media institutions shape public perception, influence politics, and maintain hegemonic power structures. They challenge dominant media systems, emphasizing grassroots participation, social justice, and resistance to hegemony.

The Frankfurt School, particularly the works of Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer, laid important philosophical foundations for alternative media. Their theory of the "Culture Industry" (Adorno & Horkheimer, 2002) argues that mass media, controlled by corporate conglomerates, serves to perpetuate capitalist ideologies and pacify the public. In this view, alternative media acts as a tool of resistance, offering an avenue for marginalized voices and counter-hegemonic narratives to emerge. Critical theorists argue that alternative media can offer a more democratic form of media production and consumption, empowering people to challenge dominant ideologies (Fuchs, 2010b).

Antonio Gramsci's "Theory of Hegemony" provides another key philosophical lens for understanding alternative media. Gramsci (1971) argued that various cultural institutions, including the media, play a crucial role in maintaining dominant ideology by promoting consent rather than coercion. From this perspective, alternative media are seen as a means to challenge hegemonic control over cultural production. Fuchs (2010a) notes that, unlike mainstream media, alternative media platforms offer counter-hegemonic narratives that confront existing power structures.

Similarly, Herman and Chomsky's (1988) "Propaganda Model" argues that mass media in capitalist societies serve the interests of elite groups by systematically filtering news content through five key mechanisms: ownership, advertising, sourcing, flak, and anti-communism (later reframed as threats of terrorism). These filters shape media narratives to align with corporate and state interests, sidelining dissenting voices and reinforcing dominant ideologies. The model asserts that rather than being neutral, mass media functions as a powerful instrument of propaganda in favor of elite interests (Herman & Chomsky, 1988). It highlights the crucial role of alternative media in fostering dissent and independent journalism.

Jürgen Habermas's concept of the "Public Sphere Theory" is another important philosophical influence on alternative media. Habermas (1962) argues that a functioning public sphere is essential for democracy, providing a space where individuals engage in rational-critical debate on public matters. In this framework, mainstream media are often seen as problematic because it prioritizes entertainment, commercial interests, and state control over meaningful public discourse. According to McChesney (2007), alternative media offers spaces where marginalized groups can participate in democratic dialogue and challenge dominant power structures.

A significant aspect of the philosophy behind alternative media are its association with "Media Activism." This concept has been explored by scholars such as Herman and Chomsky's (1988),

Downing (2001), Rodríguez (2001), Atton (2002), and Castells (2012). Media activism involves using media as a tool for social change, challenging structures of power, and promoting social justice. Media activists are committed to questioning the status quo, critiquing corporate media, and advocating for a media system that reflects the values of equity and justice (Gitlin, 2003). Philosophically, media activism draws from Marxist, post-colonial, and feminist theories that emphasize the need to challenge the material conditions shaping media production and consumption. Couldry and Curran (2003) note that "media activism" is not only about creating alternative content but also about building new, participatory media infrastructures.

Post-colonial and feminist theories also provide critical insights into alternative media. Post-colonial theorists like Edward Said (1978) argue that mainstream media often reproduces colonial narratives and power relations. In this context, alternative media offer the potential for decolonization by giving voice to those silenced by imperialist and capitalist structures. Similarly, feminist theorists critique mainstream media's portrayal of women and marginalized genders, advocating for media practices that challenge stereotypes and promote gender justice (Gill, 2007).

Paulo Freire's (1970) concept of "Participatory Communication" is central to alternative media, emphasizing media as a tool for consciousness-raising and shifting from passive consumption to active engagement and co-creation (Rodríguez, 2001). Freire's approach challenges hierarchical structures and traditional top-down communication patterns, allowing communities to express their own narratives. Instead of reinforcing power imbalances, participatory communication promotes mutual learning, empowerment, and critical consciousness, serving as a catalyst for social change and fostering a more equitable and democratic society.

John Downing highlights the importance of "Radical Media," focusing on indigenous and localized storytelling. Downing (2001) argues

that radical media empower communities to resist mainstream homogenization and preserve cultural identity. These platforms allow marginalized communities to control their own narratives, mobilize, and engage in transformative action for democracy and justice.

Denis McQuail's "Democratic Participatory Theory" emphasizes the active involvement of citizens in communication processes, advocating for decentralized and community-based media over mass media dominance (McQuail, 1987). This theory supports pluralism, decentralization, localism, and grassroots communication, ensuring that diverse voices and marginalized groups are represented. It promotes access, feedback, and interaction between media producers and audiences, enhancing civic engagement and social change (McQuail, 2010; 2013). This perspective is particularly relevant in the context of alternative media, digital platforms, and participatory journalism.

Nancy Fraser's concept of "Subaltern Counterpublics" critically expands Habermas's notion of a singular public sphere, arguing that it excludes marginalized voices such as women, minorities, and the working class. Fraser (1990) defines counterpublics as alternative spaces where subordinated groups formulate counter-discourses that challenge dominant narratives. These spaces serve both as areas for withdrawal and reorganization and as bases for contesting mainstream discourse, enhancing democratic deliberation by ensuring diverse perspectives, which has gained significant scholarly attention for addressing exclusion in democratic societies by allowing marginalized groups to articulate their identities while influencing the broader political debate. Fraser's concept has also become influential in media studies, gender studies, and postcolonial theory.

Postmodern theorists like Michel Foucault, Jean-François Lyotard, Jean Baudrillard, and Stuart Hall view alternative media as fluid, decentralized, participatory, and counter-hegemonic. Foucault (1980) emphasizes that media are shaped by power

relations rather than being neutral. Lyotard (1984) highlights skepticism toward grand narratives, suggesting that no single media system should claim exclusive authority over truth. Baudrillard (1994) argues that media shape perceptions of reality, often constructing dominant "truths." Hall (1997) contends that audiences actively interpret media messages rather than passively consuming them.

In essence, the philosophical foundations of alternative media are closely linked to critical theory, participatory communication, postmodernism, radical media traditions, and counter-hegemonic perspectives that question the authority of mainstream media. Rather than merely serving as a substitute, alternative media acts as a platform for resistance, empowerment, and the creation of oppositional narratives. Scholars have framed alternative media as a challenge to corporate owned outlets, emphasizing the need to democratize communication and amplify marginalized voices.

Alternative Media vs. Mainstream Media

Alternative and mainstream media fulfill distinct roles in society in terms of ownership, content, audience engagement, focus, and ideological stance. Broadly speaking, mainstream media tend to reflect and reinforce dominant societal views, whereas alternative media provide platforms for diverse and often marginalized voices.

Mainstream media, characterized by their wide reach, professional journalism standards, and institutional affiliations (McChesney, 2008), refer to large, established organizations that dominate public discourse and shape societal narratives through mass communication channels. In contrast, alternative media are often independent, community-driven, and centered on marginalized perspectives (Atton, 2002). They challenge dominant discourses by offering counter-hegemonic narratives and prioritizing participatory journalism (Downing, 2001).

Mainstream media typically employ a top-down, agenda-setting approach, influencing public

opinion through selective framing and gatekeeping (Herman & Chomsky, 1988). Conversely, alternative media amplify marginalized voices and present critical counter-narratives that challenge hegemonic ideas (Downing, 2001). Mainstream media often treat audiences as passive consumers, delivering information in a structured and professionalized format (Gitlin, 2003), whereas alternative media encourage active participation, utilizing citizen journalism, social media, and decentralized platforms to promote democratic engagement (Rodríguez, 2001).

While mainstream media are frequently corporate-owned and profit-driven, alternative media seek to provide platforms for marginalized voices, thereby challenging dominant narratives (Atton, 2002). Largely controlled by corporations, political institutions, or influential stakeholders, mainstream media are susceptible to commercial and political interests (McChesney, 2008), often resulting in content that reinforces the status quo by aligning with dominant ideologies. In contrast, alternative media, typically run by independent groups, activists, or grassroots organizations, prioritize non-commercial, community-based perspectives (Downing, 2001). Similarly, Atton (2002) notes that they are often community-driven, independent, or non-profit, resisting commercial and political pressures.

Mainstream media tend to focus on broadly appealing content that conform to hegemonic structures, often sidelining minority perspectives (Herman & Chomsky, 1988). They sometimes prioritize sensationalism and entertainment over in-depth investigative journalism. In contrast, Bailey et al. (2008) argue that alternative media provide counter-hegemonic content, represent marginalized communities, and promote social change.

Mainstream media follow a top-down communication model, where audiences primarily consume information passively (Curran & Seaton, 2018), whereas alternative media foster a participatory culture, encouraging citizen journalism and grassroots activism (Atton, 2004).

Mainstream media tend to align with neoliberal ideologies, prioritizing market-driven interests and corporate profitability (Schiller, 1999). Fuchs (2010b) found that, unlike mainstream media, alternative media are often associated with progressive, radical, or countercultural movements, striving for inclusivity and social justice.

Mainstream media uphold professional media standards, emphasizing objectivity and neutrality. However, critics argue that they often reinforce elite biases and corporate interests (McChesney, 2008). While more subjective and advocacy-driven, alternative media prioritize social justice, activism, and direct community engagement (Atton, 2002). Mainstream media enjoy mass distribution and institutional backing, making them dominant information sources worldwide. Couldry & Curran (2003) note that despite their more limited reach, alternative media leverage digital platforms and grassroots networks to challenge dominant narratives.

Overall, while mainstream media provide broad accessibility and institutional credibility—often reflecting elite interests—alternative media acts as a platform for dissent, fostering inclusivity and participatory communication. Together, both play crucial roles in shaping public discourse and the circulation of information.

Critique of Alternative Media

Alternative media are often praised for their role in fostering democratic discourse, amplifying marginalized voices, and challenging dominant power structures and hegemonic narratives. However, they are not free from criticism and have been challenged on various grounds, including but not limited to objectivity, the spread of misinformation, economic sustainability, comparatively limited audience reach, and expertise gaps. Alternative media aim to counter-hegemonic narratives, but these counter-narratives can also be ideologically driven, which may lead to biased coverage. Atton and Hamilton (2008) argue that alternative media often prioritize advocacy over objectivity, potentially reducing their credibility. According to Sunstein (2017),

this phenomenon becomes especially pronounced in online environments, where algorithmic content selection creates closed information ecosystems that reinforce partisan positions and minimize exposure to contradictory voices.

Critics argue that alternative media may unintentionally spread misinformation due to weak editorial oversight in their efforts to challenge mainstream narratives. Holt et al. (2019) and Staender et al. (2024) highlight that the absence of institutional checks in some alternative outlets increases the risk of unverified or misleading content. Fuchs (2018) similarly notes that minimal editorial control heightens this danger. Raja (2024) suggests that some outlets deliberately spread misinformation to advance ideological agenda, while Bennett & Livingston (2018) warn that this fuels polarization and undermines trust in credible sources, particularly in divisive political climates.

Alternative media often face significant economic hardships that affect their sustainability and reach. Atton (2002) comments that financial instability can lead to difficulties in maintaining consistent content production, paying journalists, and investing in fact-checking mechanisms. Couldry & Curran (2003) note that alternative media often lack institutional support and professional infrastructure, making them more vulnerable to external pressures, including censorship and algorithmic suppression on digital platforms. Pickard (2020) observes that financially constrained alternative outlets may rely on funding from interest groups that expect editorial alignment with their agenda, further intensifying partisan biases.

Alternative media can be amplified by algorithms that strategically tailor content to exploit digital platform mechanics, ensuring maximum visibility and engagement. Tufekci (2017) found that social media algorithms prioritize content that generates high interaction, often favoring emotionally charged, sensational, or polarizing narratives over balanced reporting. Sunstein (2017) notes that many alternative media outlets leverage these algorithms by producing highly shareable content that aligns with audience biases, reinforcing ideological echo chambers and increasing their reach. Pariser (2011) explains that algorithm-driven recommendation systems create filter bubbles that sideline dissenting perspectives. According to Napoli (2019), social media algorithms tend to prioritize engagement-driven content, making it harder for alternative voices promoting balanced discourse to gain visibility.

Some experts believe that alternative media often have comparatively smaller audiences, leading digital platforms to adopt tactical approaches for expanding their audience base. Tufekci (2017) found that algorithms on digital platforms strategically amplify alternative media by prioritizing high-engagement content, which often favors sensational or polarizing narratives. Sunstein (2017) believes that many outlets exploit these mechanics, crafting shareable material that reinforces audience biases and deepens ideological echo chambers. Pariser (2011) comments that recommendation systems further isolate users within filter bubbles, sidelining dissenting views. Napoli (2019) notes that algorithm-driven ecosystems consequently prioritize divisive content over balanced discourse.

Alternative media also frequently face expertise gaps that compromise content quality, particularly in specialized fields like science, health, and economics. Kenix (2011) notes that these outlets often lack the technical knowledge required for complex topics. Without subject-matter experts, coverage is prone to oversimplification and contextual errors (Atton & Hamilton, 2008). While offering valuable alternative perspectives, these knowledge deficiencies risk perpetuating inaccuracies that weaken their counter-narrative potential. Thus, alternative media face multifaceted criticism that must be considered when evaluating their positive contributions. This remains a crucial factor to keep in mind when discussing the overall impact of alternative media.

The Convergence Point

The convergence point between alternative media and mainstream media are a complex and

evolving space, marked by both clear distinctions and increasing overlaps. Although often seen as opposing forces, mainstream and alternative media share points of convergence where their functions, practices, and impacts intersect. Shared platforms, content cross-pollination, blurred boundaries on digital platforms, and collaborative work during crises are some of the key areas where alternative and mainstream media converge.

Shared platforms represent a major point of convergence between the two. Chadwick (2017, p. 143) claims that both now predominantly distribute content through digital platforms and social media algorithms, creating "unexpected convergences in their audience engagement strategies." Doyle (2013) found that digital convergence has facilitated vertical and horizontal integration across previously distinct media sectors, leading to new business models and revenue streams.

Content cross-pollination is another significant meeting point between alternative and mainstream media, where each influences the other. Rodríguez (2001) notes that social media platforms serve as a critical intersection, with mainstream outlets often amplifying stories originating in alternative media, especially during social upheavals and crises. Couldry and Curran (2003) observe that alternative media often rely on mainstream coverage to broaden their reach, while mainstream media borrow alternative storytelling techniques to better engage diverse audiences.

Another convergence occurs in the digital sphere, where the distinction between alternative and mainstream media increasingly blurs. Digital platforms allow independent journalists and activists to reach broader audiences, sometimes forcing mainstream media to address issues they might otherwise have ignored (Castells, 2012). In this context, Fenton (2010) notes that alternative media sometimes collaborate with mainstream media through investigative journalism, exposing corruption, human rights violations, and social injustices.

Digital platforms have also created a more collaborative environment between mainstream and alternative media. Allan and Thorsen (2009) found that during major emergencies, crises, or disasters, mainstream media frequently cite alternative media's on-the-ground reporting. At the same time, Downing (2001) notes that alternative media outlets often use mainstream framing to contextualize events. Hermida (2012) found that professional news organizations have developed systematic approaches to verifying user-generated content from alternative sources during crisis reporting, creating a mutually beneficial environment through increased accuracy and reach.

Ultimately, both alternative and mainstream media aim to serve society by delivering information. Bailey et al. (2008) rightly point out that while alternative and mainstream media operate with different philosophies, they influence each other in ways that reshape public discourse and democratic participation. They further note that their coexistence and occasional collaboration contribute to a more diverse and democratic media landscape, ensuring multiple perspectives in public discourse.

Conclusion

This paper has navigated the complex landscape of alternative media, dissecting its diverse theoretical and philosophical foundations while acknowledging the persistent challenges inherent in its conceptualization. It is theorized that alternative media plays an indispensable role in cultivating a vibrant democratic communication sphere, and its relevance is amplified by the dynamic socio-political currents of our era.

As technological innovation and societal transformations continue to reshape the media ecosystem, future scholarly endeavors must prioritize several critical areas—specifically, comparative analyses within the Nepali context, encompassing its varied cultural and regulatory landscapes. Such studies will yield profound insights into the operational dynamics of alternative media. Furthermore, a collaborative effort involving academia, practitioners, and policymakers is imperative to strengthen mechanisms that support independent media committed to upholding strict ethical standards. By addressing these gaps, future research will deepen both the theoretical

and practical understanding of alternative media's pivotal contribution to democratic discourse.

This discourses has spotlighted the distinct attributes that set alternative media apart from their mainstream counterparts—most notably, their emphasis on participatory communication, counter-hegemonic narratives, media activism, and grassroots mobilization. The ongoing evolution of alternative media, stimulated by technological and socio-political shifts, underscores its vitality. However, the sustainability of these initiatives remains a major concern, particularly in the face of commercial pressures. Thus, a synergistic alliance between academia, practitioners, and policymakers is essential to safeguard the autonomy of independent media. Overall, this paper stresses that alternative media are instrumental in challenging dominant narratives and fostering a democratic environment. Nevertheless, rigorous investigation is required to address its long-term viability, societal impact, and role in mitigating the proliferation of misinformation.

References

Adorno, T. W., & Horkheimer, M. (2002). *Dialectic of enlightenment*. Stanford University Press.

Allan, S., & Thorsen E. (2009) *Citizen journalism: Global perspectives*. Peter Lang.

Atton, C. (2002). *Alternative media*. SAGE Publications.

Atton, C. (2004). *An alternative internet: Radical media, politics and creativity*. Edinburgh University Press.

Atton, C., & Hamilton, J. F. (2008). *Alternative journalism*. SAGE Publications.

Bailey, O., Cammaerts, B., & Carpentier, N. (2008). *Understanding alternative media*. McGraw-Hill Education.

Baudrillard, J. (1994). *Simulacra and simulation*. University of Michigan Press.

Bennett, W. L., & Livingston, S. (2018). The disinformation order: Disruptive communication and the decline of democratic institutions. *European Journal of Communication*, *33*(2), 122–139. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323118760317

Castells, M. (2012). *Networks of outrage and hope: Social movements in the Internet age*. Polity Press.

Chadwick, A. (2017). *The hybrid media system: Politics and power* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

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

Curran, J., & Seaton, J. (2018). *Power without responsibility: Press, broadcasting and the internet in Britain*. Routledge.

Demir, D. (2023). A user research on alternative media. *Athens Journal of Mass Media and Communications*, *9*(1), 39–56.

Downing, J. (2001). *Radical Media: Rebellious communication and social movements*. SAGE Publications.

Doyle, G. (2013). *Understanding media economics* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Eisenstein, E. L. (1979). *The printing press as an agent of change*. Cambridge University Press.

Fenton, N. (2008). *New media, old news: Journalism and democracy in the digital age*. SAGE Publications.

Fenton, N. (2010). *New media, old news: Journalism and democracy in the digital age*. SAGE Publications.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings,* 1972–1977. Pantheon.

Fraser, N. (1990). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. In C. Calhoun (Ed.), *Habermas and the public sphere* (pp. 56–180). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.

Fuchs, C. (2010a). Alternative media as critical media. *European Journal of Social Theory*, *13*(2), 173–192. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431010362294

Fuchs, C. (2010b). *Introduction to critical theory: Horkheimer to Habermas*. SAGE Publications.

Fuchs, C. (2018). *Digital demagogue: Authoritarian capitalism in the age of trump and Twitter*. Pluto Press.

Gill, R. (2007). *Gender and the media*. Polity Press.

Gitlin, T. (2003). *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making and unmaking of the new left.* University of California Press.

Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from the prison notebooks*. International Publishers.

Habermas, J. (1962). *The structural transformation of the public sphere*. MIT Press.

Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere*. MIT Press.

Hall, S. (1997). *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices*. SAGE Publications.

Herman, E. S., & Chomsky, N. (1988). *Manufacturing consent: The political economy of the mass media*. Pantheon.

Hermida, A. (2012). Tweets and truth: Journalism as a discipline of collaborative verification. *Journalism Practice*, *6*(5–6), 659–668. https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2012.667269

Holt, K., Figenschou, T. U., & Frischlich, L. (2019). Key dimensions of alternative news media. *Digital Journalism*, *7*(7), 860–869. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2019.1625715

Kenix, L. J. (2011). *Alternative and mainstream media: The converging spectrum*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Lievrouw, L. (2011). *Alternative and activist new media*. Polity Press.

Lyotard, J. F. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. University of Minnesota Press.

McChesney, R. W. (2007). *The political economy of media: Enduring issues, emerging dilemmas*. Monthly Review Press.

McChesney, R. W. (2008). *The political economy of media: Enduring issues, emerging dilemmas*. Monthly Review Press.

McQuail, D. (1987). *Mass communication theory: An introduction*. SAGE Publications.

McQuail, D. (2010). *McQuail's mass communication theory* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.

McQuail, D. (2013). *Journalism and society*. SAGE Publications.

Napoli, P. M. (2019). *Social media and the public interest: Media regulation in the disinformation age*. Columbia University Press.

Pariser, E. (2011). *The filter bubble: How the new personalized web is changing what we read and how we think*. Penguin.

Pew Research Center. (2024, Sepember 17). *Social media and news fact sheet*. Pew Research Center.

Pickard, V. (2020). *Democracy without journalism? Confronting the misinformation society*. Oxford University Press.

Raja, A. (2024, November 20). The battle between traditional and alternative media. *King's Think Tank Spectrum*.

Rodríguez, C. (2001). *Fissures in the mediascape: An international study of citizen's media*. Hampton Press.

Said, E. (1978). *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books.

Schiller, H. I. (1999). *Digital capitalism: Networking the global market system*. MIT Press.

Staender, A., Humprecht, E., & Esser, F. (2024). Alternative media vary between mild distortion and extreme misinformation: Steps toward a typology. *Digital Journalism, 12*(6), 830–850. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2024.2326928

Sunstein, C. R. (2017). *#Republic: Divided democracy in the age of social media*. Princeton University Press.

Tufekci, Z. (2017). *Twitter and tear gas: The power and fragility of networked protest*. Yale University Press.