Answers Reviewer D:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Recommendation** | **Review** |
| Comment 1. Thanks for inviting me to read this **interesting** piece about the pensioners’ movement in Spain. I appreciate the article. I agree with the authors that insufficient attention has been paid to the pensioner’s movement. I do not totally agree, however, with the explanation of such a lack of scholarly attention; I find it hard to believe that the scholarly community fails to see the interest in this form of mobilization. As the authors discuss, the pensioners’ movement connects with central debates in relation to autonomous forms of mobilization, including diffusion, framing, and the capacity to mobilize in a sustained way. It is, however, a recent phenomenon that invites time-intensive ethnographic research. Surely a wealth of work on this topic is in the process of publication as we speak. | Claims about the lack of academic concern for the pensioners’ movements have been nuanced. From the abstract, we have specially attributed this neglect to the specific field of communication and social movements, where attention has been much more concentrated on youngsters’ civil action and their active use of digital technologies. As we state in the introduction, this academic oblivion might be related with preconceptions such as those of ‘digital natives’ and the presumed homogeneity of older users/audiences and their access to social media. In line with the reviewer's invitation to impulse research and discussions in the field, future research lines are suggested in the conclusions section. |
| Comment 2. The paper is very well written, with an engaging and fluid style. It shows proficiency with the relevant literature. The article clearly fits with the scope of the journal; it can be of interest for a variety of readers, including students of protest but also media and communication scholars. My recommendation, however, would be a review and resubmit. I have liked the article; it has great potential. Still, from my point of view, the article remains weak on important aspects. I am confident that these problems can be fixed and that the authors can come up with a stronger, ready to publish version of the piece. | We appreciate the comments about the style, potential, and originality of our article. In this line, while incorporating the suggestions and fixing the main problems pointed by the reviewer, we tried to reinforce at a maximum the fluency and readability of the text. |
| Comment 3. In my opinion, there is a problem with the focus of the article. The goals are stated in a rather obscure way.  More importantly, they seem to take quite a lot for granted, contradicting the general impression that there has been very little research on this form of mobilization. Instead of aiming at exploring the place of communication in the life course of this movement, or at discussing the relevance of considering the pensioner’s movement as a technological movement, the authors go the extra mile to explore the applicability of stereotypes and assumptions often formulated in the media-movement literature. If very little is known about this movement, it is odd to read that the goal of the article is to “demonstrate how the perceptions and appropriations of the media by the Marea Pensionista leaders differ from the technological myths that…”. Are we certain, however, that this is movement that ‘appropriates’ technology in the first place? Similarly, the authors write that the goal is to “demonstrate that the pensioners’’ media imaginaries and practices are detached form the trend to technological determinism”.   But, do we already know anything about media imaginaries? Is this a movement that ‘imagines’ in relation to the media?   I would recommend the authors to step back and **reframe their goals** in a more **broad, open way**, that connects with the fact that the agenda of research about this movement is still in its infancy. If they were to do so, the authors perhaps could be in a better position to deal with the problems of structure. In my opinion, the paper would greatly improve with the adoption of a more traditional structure, one that firstly explains what the movement does in relation to protest, technology and communication, and, subsequently, addresses questions connected with media practices. | Thanks for the suggestions. In this latest version of the article, we have avoided any tendency to take anything for granted and falling into contradictions and stereotypes. To do this, we have nuanced many assertions regarding the technological appropriations of elderly activists.  Furthermore, we have improved, re-elaborated and reframed the goals of the article, avoiding presumptions and connecting it with the incipient research agenda about elderly/pensioners social movements. We have also reinforced the structure of the article, introducing a new “Theoretical framework and empirical background”, which summarizes previous research about political participation of the elderly and its connection with social movement theories. |
| Comment 4. The description of what this movement does is scattered throughout the differently sections, not providing a clear view of the object of study. In truth I have really missed a ‘descriptive’ section that introduces this form of mobilization, one that demonstrates that communication is a big thing here. I would recommend this section to include some of the ideas now included in the ‘slow activism’ section, together with other references to repertoires and protest events. | We have avoided having the description of the movement scattered throughout different sections by introducing the research object from the beginning in the section "The pensioners' movement and their media and technological platforms", as well as in the first paragraph of "Introduction and objectives", which describes the object and serves as a hook.  On the other hand, some ideas included in the "slow media / slow activism” subsection have been brought forward to the last paragraphs of "Introduction and objectives" in order to start describing the object from the starting section. |
| Comment 5. I advise against keeping the section on ‘slow movements’, a very unclear concept that fits very poorly with the mainstays of social movement theory. Incidentally, I would strongly recommend the authors to provide cursory **definitions** of key concepts, and to assess whether the data on the pensioners’ movement can do anything to refine those concepts. | Also recommended by reviewer 2, it is true that, compared to other categories inspiring the article (media imaginary, ecology, etc.), slow activism and slow media are a brand new concepts, which are still very poorly defined. This is why we have renamed the subheading called "slow activism" changing it into a more humble: "the slow media / slow activism approach of the pensioners”. We have strengthened the theoretical underpinning of both concepts as well as the definition of the central categories above mentioned (media imaginaries, practices, etc.) from the beginning, since these are later helpful to discuss the qualitative data. We also introduce these preventions around the concept in a paragraph at the end of Introduction and later in the text. We now propose to think the central categories of our article –media imaginaries, practices, etc.- from an initial dialogue with this still poorly framed concepts. |
| Comment 6: It is quite surprising to find very late in the article a quotation of an activist saying, ‘we might not be the best at managing social networks, but we, as elderly, have the quality of talking a lot”. This is surprising and cast doubts about the exact role of communication and media practices in the case of the pensioners’ movement. Why to investigate in detail media and communication practices in a movement that perhaps rely on others forms of interaction?  Perhaps the authors could clarify this. | This comment is relevant, suggestive and made us introduce new reflections along the paper. In order to avoid contradictions throughout the article, we emphasize both in the Introduction and the Conclusions the importance of not forgetting interpersonal communication when analyzing a social movement, especially that of retirees. In this new version of the article, we have better defined concepts such as slow media and media ecologies, since they help us to emphasize the importance of investigating not only the "new" digital repertoires but also unmediated communication (in the line of the quotation of the retiree), low-tech communication forms, and older interactions with the mass media. |
| Comment 7: As a matter of fact, the authors do not sufficiently engage with the problem of point of view. They have talked to leaders. But they take for granted that leaders are communicators. However, is this really so? Is it not possible to find key mobilisers who do not have any responsibility in communication?  This problem connects with my concern about the paper, as I have already mentioned before: it is always taken for granted that communication is very relevant, that this is a techno movement. However, the data does substantiate that idea in full. The pensioners’ movement uses the internet, like virtually every single form of mobilization in the planet. At the same time, some of the interview verbatims suggest that many people could struggle with using the internet. Also, the authors insist on the role of face-to-face interaction. So, what is the precise place of digital communication and media practices?  What are we to mean when told that this movement might ‘appropriate technologies’ or produce new media ‘imagineries’? Is this just a question of a small ‘digital vanguard’? Moreover, is there a clear gap between leaders with digital skills and the grassroots without those skills? | In relation to this comment, we would like to clarify that the older people interviewed have all played a prominent role in the movement's communication (as spokespersons, social network managers, strategy designers, etc.). In other words, the sample did not look for leaders but rather for communication activists, a fact we have commented in some passages of the new version not to provoke misinterpretations. This is also why they are assumed to have broader communication awareness than other older people, a bias we have commented in Methodology. However, through an analysis of the movement's social networks accounts, this article has also explored the creation, authorship, contents and media uses of highest circulation posts in the activity peaks periods of the pensioners’ movement, which help us to affirm that media practices are not just a question of small “digital vanguard” but of ordinary activists themselves.  In the Conclusions we have reinforced the idea of extending the study to activists who are aside of communication responsibilities, for example, through surveys.  Finally, we do not intend in the article to say that retirees "produce new imaginaries". We rather claim that media and technologies have a place in the pensioners’ activist imaginary, although it is subordinated to broader political demands. |
| Comment 8: There are several small issues that seem to be very interesting but remain little explored.  For instance, intergeneration cooperation when it comes to technology. Also, the connections with the yayoflautas. It would be great to learn a bit more about those issues. | Since we have not been able to explore intergenerational transfer processes because there were no specific questions in the questionnaire, in two different passages of the article, we justify this absence and invite to explore them in future research. . Nevertheless, the connections of the pensioners' movement with the yayoflautas have been reinforced in this new version of the article, incorporating new bibliographic references. |

Reviewer E:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Recommendation | Review |
| Comment 1. Thanks to the Editors and authors for letting me read and review the manuscript. The topic is relevant and innovative, and it is nicely written. However, the paper presents certain shortcomings. | Thank you very much! |
| Comment 2: I will describe the critical aspects, according to my view. (I) General overview. The paper is presented as “exploratory” research, which is not a problem by itself. However, the argument is not focused on the main finding that they authors identify, so the main contribution is shown loosely along the results section. I am referring to “slow activism” as the paradigm from which these activists get advantage and take ICTs as part of their repertoire of collective action. The authors say: “we will try to demonstrate how the perceptions and appropriations of the media by the Marea Pensionista elderly leaders differ from the technological myths […] that characterize recent studies on media and social movements”. | Thanks for the comments. These helped us very much refine the objectives and main findings and conclusions of the article. The research goals have been qualified and clarified in the Introduction section. Now, we intend to explore how the movement of Spanish retired pensioners appropriates media and technologies and whether this appropriation is carried out strategically or from more banal, mundane, unnoticed and informal daily interactions. We also made a clear distinction between the research questions and findings associated to media imaginaries or to media practices. We eliminated the vague assertion proposed at the end of this comment. And we have finally cleared up the main findings, making them much more specific. We have finally developed this task by opening a humble between the central categories of the text and the new concepts of slow activism which still need further research. |
| Comment 3: So, the paper should be focused on this, showing the characteristics of that appropriation, highlighting the main finding: the slow activism frame. Currently the paper is a loose description of their way of assuming ICTs as a communication tool. | We have reframed, focused and added new bibliographic references to argue the slow dimension of the pensioners' movement. It is true that both slow media and slow activism are brand new concepts, which are still poorly defined. This is why we introduced these preventions at the end of Introduction and later in some other excerpts of the article. Now, wepropose to think the central categories of our article –media imaginaries, practices, etc.- from an initial dialogue with this concepts which are still under construction. Furthermore, we have given more importance to the empirical background and the theoretical framework. Doing so, we have identified an empirical gap that has allowed us to substantiate our main findings. |
| Comment 4: Please, do professional review of the uses of English, because I can find relevant mistakes even not being native speaker | The article has been proofread by a native translator. But if you need further reforms, just let us know. |
| Comment 5: (Lack of) Theoretical framework. The paper lacks a proper theoretical framework. Though the authors show a prominent use of the social movements’ literature, they do not write a theoretical reflection which can be the base for inductive research or thinking. This is a central problem of the paper. The authors should work on this rigorously. | In the new version of the article, we have developed a new part called: “Theoretical framework and empirical background”. This supports better our main aims and findings. This contribution made it possible to clarify the main argument and connect the theoretical dimension with the fieldwork and the findings. Following the comments of both reviewers, the work is now better articulated and has greater internal coherence. |
| Comment 6: In the second section of the paper, the authors explain the social movement (the case) and its components: this is nicely developed; but they describe their theoretical guides in just one paragraph at the end of the section. Thus, they do not develop the “myths” they say to depart from, or to criticize. So, in the end, it seems that they depart from stereotypes, not from previous research and theory. This is a major problem. Any rigorous research should make explicit its theoretical assumptions. | We have divided the second section into two sections. First, we have explained the movement and its components just as we had done in the previous version; the title of this section has been changed to be more accurate with the content. Secondly, we have added a new section entitled “Theoretical framework and empirical background" where we set forth the research lines that have been carried out along studies both on activism of the elderly and communication and (anti-austerity), movements where the movement of retired pensioners is usually assimilated. Thus, we identify an empirical gap in the field of communication and social movements as the media activism of the retired pensioners movement has not yet been studied as a specific object of research with its own distinctive characteristics. We have finally limited to put the main focus of the article on the myths or technological determinism around activism and its use of ICTs. This discussion has been nuanced, cleared up and improved along the article. |
| Comment 7: The authors say on page 6 that they draw on “a non-systematic review of academic and journalistic articles”. This decision is difficult to explain and cannot be justified on the grounds of an inductive research process. Even an inductive design needs a previous review of the literature. | We fully agree with the reviewer's comment. However, we want to clarify that the "non-systematic review of academic and journalistic articles" was carried out to write only the first section after the Introduction (called The pensioners' movement, their platforms and their myths). This is a descriptive section that aims to show the origin, evolution and the pensioners' movement forms of organization. We have then fully eliminated this misleading comment.  In addition, the knowledge that the authors got through their direct participation in some of the demonstrations of the pensioners' movement was also key to prepare this section. However, we consider that this may be a truism that does not contribute, but rather hinders, the understanding of the work carried out, especially taking into account the exhaustive literature review that we have accomplished to design the research, carry out the theoretical framework, analyze the data, and conduct the discussion. All this work would not have been possible without an exhaustive literature review on the topic, but we do not make any mention to this “implicit” review task in the Methodological framework. |
| Comment 8: In this case, we would need a theoretical section on elderly people’s views or use of ICTs in the context of social movements, or at least a review of what has been assumed about (senior) age and use of ICTs in social movements. | As we have previously mentioned, in this second version of the article we have added a specific section with the theoretical framework and the empirical background that support the research. We are firmly convinced that this new section brings more solidity and coherence to the article. |
| Comment 9: Materials and methods. This section also has several serious challenges.  First, it is necessary to anonymize the names of interviewees, or at least to say if they accepted to be included with their actual names. Maybe the authors used pseudonyms, we do not know, and this is a serious ethical problem. | The interviewees accepted to be included in the article with their real names. Therefore, we haven't had any ethical dilemma to solve regarding the personal data of the interviewees. This aspect has been clarified in the methodology section in this second version of the article. |
| Comment 10: Second, regarding the analysis, the authors suggest that the findings reflect “the most meaningful consensuses”, but they also exhibit discrepancies and dissimilarities in discourses, as it is always recommendable in any qualitative research. The authors should revise their approach to analysis, e.g., if they apply thematic analysis, interpretive analysis, sociological discourse analysis, etc., and incorporate a more complex understanding of qualitative research non based on “consensuses” but on common ideas and conflictive discourses. +  Also, it is recommendable to be explicit with the procedure used to reach these findings (if the authors used individual memoires or reports, reading, and summarizing of the discourses after coding the interviews according to a set of analytical dimensions…). The procedure should be made explicit. Here, we can see again the problem of lacking a theoretical framework, because it implies lacking a clear analytical framework working as guide for observation, coding, and discourse analysis | Thanks for this very useful comment. We fully agree with the reviewer's point. As we have already shown in the Results section, we do not base on "the most meaningful consensuses", but rather on common ideas, discrepancies and conflicts, which are discussed in the light of our three strong theoretical concepts (media imaginaries, practices and ecology). For this reason, we have removed the expression. In addition, and following the reviewer's comments, we have substantially expanded and detailed the explanation of the methodological procedure, indicating the type of content analysis we developed and the interview categorization system. Also we nuanced and clarified the criteria and methods we used to access and analyzed the discourses of the communication activists, along with the content analysis of the movement's social networks accounts. |
| Comment 11. Thirdly, the authors hardly can say that they did participant observation (it is not “participatory” but participant). Ethnography or participant observation requires the observation of interactional patterns which is only possible in scenarios where agents act together (see Hammersley & Atkinson, 2019, for example). Consequently, the authors could say that they did observation in Facebook or maybe in twitter, but I have serious doubts that they can say this about webpages. If their decision of calling it “observation” was strongly justified by other methodological works, please, let us know. In my view, it would be more cautious to talk about web mining or desk analysis of web documentation. | Thanks very much for this useful input! According the recommendation of the reviewer, we have removed the term “participant observation”, which needs further problematization, although we already participated in some of the pensioners’ demonstrations. Instead, we have reinforced the aspect of the qualitative content analysis of the messages and the activities developed in the social accounts of the organizing platforms that shape the movement. We have then fully explained the procedure followed to accomplish such analysis. In this line, we consider that the work improved and is now much more solid and rigorous. |
| Comment 12. Fourthly, on page 10, before results, the authors point to nine categories that were used for the analysis. How do they connect these categories with the theoretical frame? Why do they include these categories and not others?  Further, this is quite confusing because these categories do not coincide with the three sections or dimensions used to write the results’ section. This problem refers again to the lack of theoretical and analytical framework. | We have eliminated the confusing analytic categories that we introduced after the list of informants. In the previous version, we used them as connectors for the reading but they might actually be misleading. In this version we opted to give an emphasis and better define the key-concepts that articulate the research: media imaginaries, practices and ecologies, which are put into dialogue with the slow dimension in the last part of the article. |
| Comment 13. I do not see the contribution of images beyond ornamentation. Further, the authors do not usually explain the contribution of images. Also, as images show information in Spanish it is not clear that they are going to be understood by an international audience. | Explanations of the images have been incorporated into the second version of the article. In this way, their contribution to the main argument becomes clearer. |
| Comment 14. Discussion. The discussion is only a synthesis of the main findings, but we do not know how relevant these results are from a theoretical perspective, because the authors hardly compare or triangulate with the previous literature. This is obviously related, again, with the lack of a solid theoretical section. | Thanks for the comment. Actually, the discussion was developed in the three sections of Results and not in the section of Conclusions as we had in the previous version. For this reason, the results section is now titled “Results and discussion”, since the discussion is developed there. In addition, in the second version the entire discussion has been reinforced taking as a reference our three main categories and the central arguments that we are defending. Also the conclusions provide a better dialogue regarding the preceding theoretical framework and try to give an answer to the new research questions we improved in this second version of the article. |