

INDEX

- Administrative rationalism
 - environmentalism, 36, 61
- Advocacy campaigns on
 - Twitter, 30
- Amazon Elastic Compute
 - Cloud, 152
- @Amelia_Womack, 44, 78, 101, 105, 108, 114
- @Another_Europe, 40, 43, 105
- Anti-Brexit accounts, 43, 91, 105, 113
- API. *See* Application Programming Interface (API)
- Application Programming Interface (API), 4
- Asymmetrical Twitter
 - space, elite domination in
 - asymmetric structure, 70–74
 - attention-driven
 - prominence of elites, 81–83
 - decentralisation and anarchy on, 74–81
- Attention-based retweeting
 - networks, 72, 109
- Attention-influenced
 - discursive arguments, 112–113
- @Avaaz, 51, 53
- AWS-EC2, 152
- @BBCHARDtalk, 79, 103
- @BBCNews, 79, 103, 105, 124
- @BBCRealityCheck, 79, 103–104
- Betweenness centrality
 - scores, 89, 92–94, 104
- Big data, 5, 7–8, 151–153
- Big social media data, 7, 146, 147, 149–150, 160
- @BirdLifeEurope, 78, 120–121
- @BorisJohnson, 43, 48, 78, 100, 108, 116–118
- Brexit
 - and of Brexiteers’
 - immigration concerns, 47–48

- on British environmental policies, 61
- campaign, 122
- environmental benefits, 117, 127
- environmental impacts and implications, 47, 54–61
- Brexiteers
 - arguments, 48
 - climate deniers and, 122
 - immigration concerns, 47
 - Remainers and, 65, 133
- Bridging nodes, 81, 94, 102, 109–110
- Campaign-oriented
 - tweeting strategies, 113
- @CarolineLucas, 41, 44, 50, 56–57, 64, 75, 78, 86, 99–102, 108, 116–117
- @ClimateHome, 56, 75, 79, 97, 122
- Climate Home News, 122–123
- @ClimateRetweet, 72, 75, 79, 92–93
- Clustering coefficient values, 94
- Communities, 133
 - green camps, 100–102
 - interactions and
 - information flow, 99–100
 - loosely connected or isolated communities, 97–99
 - sparse communities, 91–97
- Computational multi-method analysis, 154
- Computer scientists and social scientists, 159
- Connected clusters, 98, 103
- Conservatism, 20
- Conservative Party, 21, 32, 113–115, 117–118, 133, 137
- Content words, 39, 53–55, 154
- Continuously tweeting, 49
- Core egonets, 72, 73, 86–87
 - of green camps, 103
 - loosely connected or isolated communities, 97–99
 - mixed-methods, data analysis, 155–157
 - news media and
 - journalists, 103–107
 - and political parties, 78–81
 - twitter communication, asymmetric structure of, 72, 73
- Corpus linguistic techniques, 154
- Daily Express*, 53
- @Daily_Express, 51, 79, 103–104, 123
- Daily Mail*, 20
- Daily Telegraph*, 20, 122

- Data driven inductive approach, 149
- @David_Cameron, 64, 78, 100, 108, 116, 117
- Decentralisation and anarchy on Twitter
 - core egonets and political parties, 78–80
 - influential nodes, 77
 - lack of persistence, 77
 - news media, politicians, political parties and ENGOs, 78–79
 - political parties, 77
 - retweeting networks, 77
 - tweets trends, 74, 76
 - users attention, 81
- Deductive and inductive, methodological approaches, 146–147
- Degree, 72, 89–90
- Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA), 24
- @DesmogUK, 122
- Digital ethnography, 149
- Digital humanity study, mapping, 88
- Discourses
 - dichotomised claims in pre-referendum, 37–49
 - dominant claims, 49–54
 - environmental topics, concerns on, 63–64
 - popular (retweeted) users, 50–52
 - post-referendum, 54–63
- Dobson's ecological citizenship concept, 16–17
- @DrJillStein, 78, 101, 108
- Ecological citizenship, 16, 134–135
- Ecological footprints, 16
- @EdinburghGreens, 81
- Egonets, 10, 72, 74, 78, 80, 83, 86, 87, 94–97, 100–109, 156
- ElasticSearch, 7, 39, 152–154, 156
- Elite groups, 77, 81, 83, 101, 107, 135, 139
- 'Energy bills/costs' argument, 49
- @Energydesk, 57, 61, 75, 77, 78, 97, 108, 120
- ENGOs camp, 119–123
 - See also* Environmental Nongovernment Groups (ENGOs)
- Environmental communication on social media, 2
- Environmental data, 5–6
- Environmentalism, 20, 36, 61, 65, 140
- Environmental mobilisation, 119
- Environmental Nongovernment Groups (ENGOs), 2, 8, 32

- associates and
 - environmental online media, 86
 - environmental politics, 132–133
- Environmental online media source, 72, 94
- Environmental politics
 - awareness and
 - politicisation in UK, 17–23
 - in Britain, 134
 - global rise of, 13–17
 - immersed in social media, 140–144
 - old and new players, 139–140
 - shared affordances, 131–133
 - social constructivist approach, 132
 - social context, influence of, 132–135
 - technological affordances, 135–139
 - Twitter in public participation, 132
 - UK'S EU membership, 23–24
- Environmental revolution, 14
- Environmental topics,
 - concerns on, 63–64, 120, 154
- Environmental tweets, 5, 6, 36, 37, 39, 49, 53, 55, 63, 70, 74, 86, 89, 101, 103, 122–123
- Excel, 152–154
- @FoEScot, 78, 121
- Fragility, 141
- Framing and sentiment analysis, 150
- Full egonets, 72, 94, 101, 103, 107, 156
- @GdnPolitics, 44, 79, 103–104, 123
- Gephi, 7, 152–153, 156
- Global civic movement
 - organisation, 49, 53
- Global public
 - environmental awareness
 - Dobson's ecological citizenship concept, 16–17
 - ecological citizenship, 16
 - ENGOS, 15
 - environmental revolution, 14
 - green consumerism, 14
 - greenfreeze refrigerator, 15
 - Green Party movement, 14–15
 - media campaigns, 15
 - political and policy agendas, 14
 - trans-boundary pure environmental perspectives, 17
 - Western Europe, 14
- Government surveillance disclosures, 88
- Graph density and clustering coefficient, 89

- @Greens4Animals, 102
- Green camps, 103
 - bridging nodes, 102
 - ENGOS camp, 102
 - Green Party, 101–102
 - political parties, core egonets of, 102
- Green consumerism, 14
- ‘Green decision of a lifetime’, 41, 46–49, 77, 116
- Greenfreeze refrigerator, 15
- @GreenKeithMEP, 64, 78, 86, 101, 102, 103, 108, 109, 114, 116
- @GreenLibDems, 115–116, 118
- Green Party, 2, 8, 21, 30–32, 47
 - camp, 114
 - environmental politics, 132–133
 - and its associates, 86, 114
 - movement, 14–15
 - theme, 115
 - tweets and arguments, 46
- Greenpeace, 8, 15, 32, 97–99, 120
- Green politicians, 107–110, 115–117
- @GreensEP, 81
- the *Guardian*, 20, 22, 103–105, 123, 125
- @guardian, 79, 103, 105, 124
- @guardianeco, 79, 105, 123
- @GuardianSustBiz, 79, 105, 123
- Hashtags, 4, 31, 152, 154
- Immigration, 1, 5, 9, 22, 37, 46, 47
- In-degree, 89–90
- Indicating words, 39–40, 53, 55
- Influential nodes, 77–78, 103
- Influential social actors, 153–154
 - categories, 125–127
 - ENGOS camp, 119–123
 - loosely connected or isolated communities, 97–99
 - news media and journalists, 123–125
 - political parties and politicians, 113–119
 - social network analysis (SNA), 91
- Information flow
 - characteristics, 153
- Isolated nodes, 99, 103
- Isolated single nodes, 97
- @iVoteStay, 72, 75, 93
- @jeremycorbyn, 50, 78, 100, 108, 116–118
- Kibana, 7, 152–154, 156
- Laboratory for Energy and the Environment (LFEE), 18–19

- Labour Party, 9, 21, 32, 113–115, 117–118, 127, 137
- @lboroCRCC, 103
- Liberal Democrats, 21, 32, 113–114, 115, 133, 137
- Liberalism, 20
- Literature, social media research, 157–158
- Loosely connected or isolated communities
 - connected clusters, 98
 - core egonets, 97–99
 - influential social actors, 98
 - isolated single nodes, 97
 - retweeting connections, 97
- @LouiseBoursUKIP, 49, 78, 113, 116, 117–118
- Low density community-clusters, 109
- Low-density networks, 90, 109
- Machine learning techniques, 150
- Major cluster, 98, 103
- Manual coding and computational analysis, 154
- Media ecology, 25–27
- Media-mediated communication, 30
- Mediated political communication, 69
- Mixed-methods, data analysis
 - computer applications, 157
 - computer tools, 156
 - core egonets, 156–157
 - data conversion, 156
 - inductive reasoning, 157
 - multi-dimensional features, 155
 - in SNA, 156–157
- @MollyMEP, 81, 86, 92, 97, 102–103, 105, 108, 109, 115
- Monthly active users (MAUs), 25–26
- @natalieben, 41, 46, 64, 77, 78, 86, 101–102, 108, 109, 116
- National-interest-driven environmental discourses, 143
- Networked listeners, 88
- News media and journalists
 - betweenness centrality scores, 104
 - core egonets, 103–106
 - environmental organisation, 105
 - green camps, 103
 - the *Guardian*, 103–104
 - influential social actors, 123–125
 - isolated nodes, 103
 - major cluster, 103

- Obama campaign in 2008, 26
- Observer*, 22
- Office for National Statistics (ONS), 19
- Offline reality, 140–144
- Offline referendum campaign, 65
- Online activism, 51, 141
- Ontological drift, 149, 159
- Original statements and retweeted tweets, 70–71
- Out-degree, 89–90, 94
- Political commentators and bloggers, 88
- Political mobilisation, 119, 121
- Political parties and non-green politicians, 107–108
- Popularity and activity level, 70
- ‘Post-cosmopolitan’ citizenship, 16
- Post-referendum discourse, 54–63
- Pre-referendum discourses, dichotomised claims in Brexit and of Brexiteers’ immigration concerns, 47–48
 - content words, 39
 - continuously tweeting, 49
 - Elasticsearch, 39
 - ‘energy bills/costs’ argument, 49
 - environmental corporation, 47
 - environmental issues and immigration, 46–47
 - funding and regulations, 40
 - green decision of a lifetime, 48
 - Green Party, 47
 - Green Party’s tweets and arguments, 46
 - indicating words, 39–40
 - materialist claims, 48
 - popular users, 40–45
 - referendum campaign, 48
 - Remainers’ arguments, 46
 - themes types, 37–40
 - transnational environmental concerns, 40–46
- Public discourses on social media, 112
- Public domain, tweets published in, 155
- Public participation and communication, 143
- Rationalism
 - environmentalism, 61
- Referendum campaign, 48
 - economy and migration in, 3
 - energy bills in, 48
 - offline, 65
 - Twitter during, 3–4, 114
- Referendum day, dominant claims of remain
 - Brexit to natural disasters, 54

- content words, 54
- global civic movement
 - organisation, 53
- popular (retweeted) users, 49–52
- themes, 53
- Remainers
 - arguments, 46
 - and Brexiteers, 65, 133
- Retweeting, 4, 10, 72, 100, 112, 122
 - connections, 97
 - networks, 77, 86, 105, 109
 - relationship, 89, 114
- Royal Society for Protection of Birds (RSPB), 15, 124
- @SadiqKhan, 52, 78
- Scottish National Party (SNP), 113, 115, 118, 133, 137
- Shared affordances, 131–133
- @SkyNewsBreak, 79, 103, 105, 123
- Social actors, relationships and interactions, 87–88
- Social media
 - communication, 1–2, 140–144
 - and public discourses, 112
- Social media research
 - inductive approach, advantages and limitations, 158–160
 - literature, 158
 - methodological challenges, 145–151
 - mixed-methods and computational applications, 155–157
 - process, 151–155
- Social network analysis (SNA), 153–154
 - campaigns formation, 88
 - communities, *See* Communities
 - degree, 89–90
 - graph density and clustering coefficient, 89
 - influential social actors, 91
 - news media and journalists, 103–107
 - political parties and non-green politicians, 107–108
 - ‘retweeting’ relationship, 89
 - social actors, relationships and interactions, 87–88
 - of social media, 87–90
- Spam campaign detecting study, 88
- Sparse communities
 - betweenness centrality score, 94
 - clustering coefficient values, 94
 - egonets, 94–97

- environmental online
 - media source, 94
 - networks, 91–94
- SPSS, 7, 152–153
- Strong ties, 90
- Swiss “nuclear withdrawal initiative”, 88
- Technical barriers, 146, 159
- Technological affordances
 - asymmetrical Twitter communication, 135
 - attention-based control, 136
 - digital divides, 135, 138
 - inequalities in attention, 137
 - legitimacy of expression, 136–138
 - overall national-interest-driven discourse, 138
 - retweeting networked communities, 137
 - symbolic capital, 136–137
 - users attention, 135
- @TelePolitics, 79, 103, 105, 123–124
- @TheGreenParty, 41, 46–47, 75, 77–79, 81, 92, 100, 114, 116
- Total taxes and social contributions (TTSC), 19
- Traditional news media, 25, 27, 62, 103, 111–112
- Traditional political communication, 69, 140
- Traditional social science research, 146–148
- Transnational ecological citizenship, 134–135
- Tweets trends, 74, 76
- Twitter
 - advocacy campaigns on, 30
 - Application Programming Interface (API), 4
 - Australian flood crises in 2010 and 2011, 88
 - for certain purposes, 88
 - communication studies, 27–29
 - competing site, 113
 - decentralisation and anarchy on, 74–81
 - environmental communication on, 29–32
 - Gezi Park protests in Turkey, 88
 - hashtags, 4
 - internet- or mobile-based, 26
 - media ecology, 27
 - old and new players, 139–140
 - Pakistan floods, 88
 - during referendum campaign, 3–4
 - technical features, 133
 - topic networks, 88
 - Twitter4j, 152

- Twitter communication,
 - asymmetric structure of
 - active and popular users, 74–75
 - active user, 72
 - attention-based
 - retweeting networks, 72
 - core egonets, 72, 73
 - degree, 72
 - full egonets, 72
 - original statements and retweeted tweets, 70–71
 - popularity and activity level, 70
 - users types, 73
- UK green taxes, 20
- UK Independence Party (UKIP), 113–114, 118
- Users
 - active and popular, 74–75, 83
 - attention, 81
 - frequently mentioned, 81–83
 - types, 73
- @vote_leave, 43, 45, 48
- @Vote-LeaveMedia, 43, 48
- Weak ties, 90, 108
- Web 2.0, 26
- @WhyToVoteGreen, 44, 51, 75, 77, 92–93, 105, 108
- Wildlife Trusts, 121–122
- @WildlifeTrusts, 40, 41, 50, 56, 70, 74, 75, 77, 78, 92, 93, 120
- @wwwfoecouk, 75, 77, 78, 102, 103, 108, 109, 121