

Transgressive communication for social change: Performative epistemologies and cultural efficacy

Comunicación transgresora de cambio social: epistemologías performativas y eficacia cultural

Eloísa Nos Aldás  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-8871-976X>

Department of Communication Sciences, Universitat Jaume I, Spain, aldas@uji.es

Alessandra Farné  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5431-9143>

Department of Translation and Communication, Universitat Jaume I, Spain, farn@uji.es

Abstract: This article addresses the concept of cultural efficacy as a paradigm of Communication for Peace and Social Change, heir of the epistemological turn developed by Vicent Martínez Guzmán's Philosophy for Peace. This paper reviews his legacy of peace research as a proposal of dialogic, committed, transformative and interdisciplinary social sciences that define the role of communication in the social fabric from discursive-performative and cultural conceptual and methodological approaches. Finally, we apply this theoretical review of communicative responsibility to a first exploratory study on the refugee and migration crisis.

Key words: communication, efficacy, epistemologies, information literacy, social change.

Resumen: Este artículo aborda el concepto de eficacia cultural como paradigma de una Comunicación para la Paz y el Cambio Social, heredero del giro epistemológico desarrollado por la Filosofía para hacer las paces de Vicent Martínez Guzmán. Este trabajo recupera su legado desde las investigaciones para la paz como propuesta de unas ciencias sociales dialógicas, comprometidas, transformadoras e interdisciplinarias, que definen el papel de la comunicación en la configuración social desde enfoques conceptuales y metodológicos discursivo-performativos y culturales. Finalmente, aplicamos esta revisión teórica de la responsabilidad comunicativa a un primer estudio exploratorio vinculado con migraciones y refugio.

Palabras clave: cambio social, competencia informacional, comunicación, eficacia, epistemologías.

Original article
language:
spanish.
Translated
by Noel Bye
Jakobson

Recepción:
20/06/19

Aprobación:
28/10/19



Introduction¹

This article discusses the concept of “cultural efficacy” as a paradigm for Communication for Peace and Social Change, which is the legacy of the epistemological shift developed by Vicent Martínez Guzmán (La Vall d’Uixó, 1949-Barcelona, 2018) in his *Philosophy for Peace*. This article reviews the author’s research on peace as a theoretical-conceptual framework, and how it was applied in work over a 20-year period. It also includes the transfer of a line of work on Communication, as UNESCO Chair of Philosophy for Peace, and at the Interuniversity Institute for Social Development and Peace at the Universitat Jaume I (Castellón, Spain), which he established and where he developed a Master’s Degree and Doctoral Program in International Studies in Peace, Conflict and Development (Nos Aldás, 2010a).

Based on his education in the philosophy of language, the proposals set out by this activist academic –brilliantly synthesized by Forastelli (2013)– have helped redefine and establish the practical and scientific environment for the Human and Social Sciences in terms of public commitment; the guiding light of his work was always that philosophy and epistemology had to be of use to the public.

This article examines Martínez Guzmán’s legacy –his dialogical, intercultural and interdisciplinary proposals, which provide the theoretical, methodological and practical keys to analyzing human conflict and our capacity to transform it by peaceful means– alongside Communication for Social Change (Nos Aldás and Santolino, 2015). Communication for Social Change (CSC) has evolved from work and debate on the tradition of Communication for Development and Social Change (Tufte, 2015), from its transformative approaches and strong Latin American influence (Chaparro, 2015; Marí Sáez, 2018) and from Communication for Peace, Cooperation and Conflict Transformation (Farné and López Ferrández, 2016; Nos Aldás, 2013).

The opening approach is a “discursive philosophy” based on a discourse ethic that appeals to the power of communication described by Arendt (1998) and Habermas (1984) (Martínez Guzmán, 2001: 114-116; 1994). Martínez Guzmán proposes that we “question the way we do things, question

1 This paper is part of the projects: “Communication for Social Change and Media Education to face hate speech on gender and migration: analysis of public discourses during 2016-2019” (UJI-B2019-13). Duration: 2020-2022. / “Digital Social Education” (PGC2018-095123-B-I00). Duration: 2019-2021.

social structures (and the discourse we use to represent them), not viewing them as given, but reflecting on how they can be changed” (Nos Aldás, 2002: 316). His analysis of the relation between discourse (communication), culture and power, of the performativity of language, reveals the political consequences of this connection, and he proposes a pragmatic position on the assumption that *We can make peace* (Martínez Guzmán, 2005b), a slogan adopted in the communication strategies developed by numerous non-violent social movements over the decades to show how the citizenry can be motivated and mobilized. This book, subtitled “Ethical reflections in the wake of September 11 and March 11”, is centered on the position that “always, under any circumstances, and over and over again”, we must keep working to achieve peaceful coexistence.

This encompasses an understanding of scientific work and its epistemologies based on the political responsibility to exert influence in the public sphere, with its spaces for “acting together (...) ‘sharing words and acts’” and exercising power “systematically” among each and every one of us (Arendt, 1998, 2005 in Martínez Guzmán, 2015a: 1271) through research, education and communication.

This “epistemologies for peacemaking” approach comes from an understanding of inequality and the pursuit of justice based on freedom and capabilities (Sen in Comins and Martínez Guzmán, 2010; Nussbaum in Giri, 2006), in dialogue with plural, transgressive and subordinate perspectives such as ecofeminism (Mies and Shiva, 1997 in Martínez Guzmán, 2001; Puleo, 2011), which suggest policies (migratory but also educational) for cultures based on cosmopolitan hospitality (Martínez Guzmán, 2003), with their roots in Martínez Guzmán’s deeply post-colonialist, feminist and intercultural way of thinking. He always studied, cited and learned from the female perspective in all its conditions and environments in order to test and complete his own learning and way of teaching, which today provides a starting point for doctoral theses in feminist peace research (Castillo Mateu, 2019).

In sum, and in line with what one of Martínez Guzmán’s main supporters described as the “three epistemological-regulatory challenges that should guide peace research” (Comins Mingol, 2018), this article proposes the concept of “cultural efficacy” (Nos Aldás, 2007; 2010b) through a review of the epistemology of the communication sciences based on an epistemological shift towards education for peace, social intervention and activism which, in the university context, we would also define as transfer. This proposal involves incorporating critical, propositional and transformative approaches

as well as other actions that generate “theoretical, critical and mobilizing frameworks” (Comins Mingol, 2018: 147).

Questions on the theoretical framework and reconstruction of the state of the question

No other discipline is so widely questioned, in terms of the ideas discussed in previous paragraphs, as the Communication Sciences, right down to its very reason for existence: to study, interpret, evaluate and design the scenarios of our mediations (Martín Barbero, 1998; 1987). Symbolic and cultural elements play a crucial role in shaping societies. We understand Communication Sciences as coming from the communicology of liberation and its emancipatory approaches (Marí Sáez, 2018), as a way of thinking; communication based on the weave of culture articulated by processes of communication, cultural practices and social movements, whose aim is to override dichotomies and display the complex maps of current communication scenarios (Martín Barbero, 2014).

Focusing on communication's socio-cultural role in configuring global social justice, we realize that its epistemologies need to be “hacked” from open source code (Sampedro, 2015), and an explicit description of its intentions and positions provided. These current trends were posited by Martínez Guzmán in his review of the philosophy of science, arguing in favor of a discursive, critical and reconstructive epistemology that explains our positioning, choices, intentions and concerns as scientists, educators, politicians or managers, because they are always present. So, in the words of Mignolo (2010), we choose non-violent “epistemic disobedience” (Nos Aldás and Farné, 2018) for “cultures for peacemaking” (Comins and Martínez Guzmán, 2010: 56) that transform violence from the same conceptions of knowledge and their ethical applications and consequences, which add complexity to the cosmo-perspectives that regulate our behaviors, because the concept of life is as broad (peace, politics, the economy) as are the cultures, logic and circumstances that we can enumerate. But this is not undertaken from an

uncritical, pseudo-progressive position on whatever proposal simply because it derives from these other cultures (...) it comes from the recognition of the value of being disputed and questioned and not from the relativist attribution of the same value to all cultures. Not everything is correct and appropriate, and not everything holds the same value; we do not have to decide that “some” are worth more, at the expense of “others” (Martínez Guzmán, 1999; 2001: 287).

Based on these premises, we have reviewed the epistemology, the reason for existence of the communication sciences and practices, in order to analyze their social and cultural effects on communities in the short and long term, through interdisciplinary collaboration with all its dimensions and interconnections, from public health to peaceful coexistence, and aware of how much knowledge and how many options have been left behind and omitted, because, as Comins Mingol (2018: 153) states, “the epistemological inversion [of Martínez Guzmán (2000)] makes it essential to correct the unequal representation of peace”.

The concepts of objectivity and efficacy are the main pillars in the theoretical development of Communication. They frame the idea of models (scenarios) of linear, vertical communication, and with imbalances of power, or the opposite, circular, horizontal models open to negotiation. Martínez Guzmán’s epistemological shift reinterprets these two key concepts (objectivity and efficacy) from the perspective of intersubjectivity, communicative solidarity and mutual questioning.

He posits the idea of replacing objectivity with intersubjectivity (Martínez Guzmán, 2005b) because the most rigorous option and the one that draws us closer to reality is one that involves as many perspectives as possible, constructs integrating narratives that bring in voices from different levels of power and styles of knowledge (military, civil, scientific, agricultural), and dialogue (dialogism). This is a questioning of ourselves and each other as part of the very framework, study and design of communication: conceiving communication as an interactive process, as a conversation that self-evaluates and constantly constructs in a collective way.

Castillo Mateu (2019) recalls that Martínez Guzmán (2001: 71) applied feminist analysis to suggest how cultural (Galtung, 2003) and symbolic violence (Bourdieu, 2000) can “overshadow our moral responsibility” and how “there are forms of domination that we are ‘blind’ to precisely because of the subtle way in which they permeate human relations”, which leads to a “criticism of modern sciences as a source of cultural violence”. What is more, “objectivity disbars others from the moral community” (Martínez Guzmán, 2001: 164 in Castillo Mateu, 2019: 48).

Communication theories and their scientific approaches act as interpretative frames, as explained in the framing theories (Entman, 2007; Goffman, 1974; Lakoff, 2004) applied to all types of discourse, and science and its epistemologies are just one more. Therefore, it is necessary to review these theories and approaches, and the political and economic positions that shape them within the scientific community, as a community of international communication.

This is a perspective with a long historical memory that invites us to unlearn the rational Western model based on communicative rationality (Apel and Habermas, of the Frankfurt School's second generation) by conceiving of science as "a discursive community" where to unlearn and recover what we have discarded along the way by not listening to others (Marí Sáez, 2012; Martínez Guzmán, 2001: 108; Rodríguez and Moreno, 2016), and where we can transform vices derived from confronting one type of reasoning against others (Nos Aldás, 2002: 314); those epistemologies of the South developed by Santos (2011), because epistemology can act as cultural violence, or its opposite.

This review of communicative efficacy based on peace research proposals connects with cultural studies, gender studies, post-colonialist theories and Communication for Social Change (CSC) in the definition of a paradigm for the Human and Social Sciences, and the study of Communication from a critical, transformative efficacy grounded in the analysis of discourse performativity, its cultural implications and the social conceptions that they promote or legitimize.

This understanding of the sciences supersedes the relation between subject (researcher) and object (that which is researched) to open up processes of questioning and dialogue between subjects (groups, communities, people). It is an approach that always aims to understand and compose a complete picture of the realities under investigation. If we transfer this to the field of communication, it involves a reflection on the complexity of experiences without dichotomizing, gathering up all opinions and experiences from different places in order to avoid exclusion and unleashing new violence. Such features predict the main risks of violent representations as seen throughout the history of civilizations, in the form of dehumanization, stigmatization, inequality, discrimination and exclusion. Above all, a performative epistemology has to contemplate the inclusion of evaluation, which makes it impossible to stand on the sidelines in "science", research or education, because these always require responsibilities to be taken in order to transform injustice and point out its origins and causes, that is, the sciences and their application must "perform", act and intervene by proposing alternatives.

In conclusion, the epistemological shift applied here conceives of discourses as mediators between identities, beliefs, behaviors and actions, and proposes that we question them based on the conviction that it is possible to change the conditions that perpetuate injustice and do things differently and, thus, collectively unlearn what hinders us from doing so.

Redefinition of communication efficacy for social change: performativity, transgression and cultural efficacy

Communication, like language, is both a social product and social practice, so it is determined by context, but it also effects that context (Fairclough, 1989; Hall, 1997). We start from the notion of communication as a “system that organizes public communication” (Benavides, 1997; Habermas, 1994), in which individuals, social groups and institutions configure their relations. These communication scenarios are spaces mediated by discourses where the interaction between different interlocutors shapes social relations and institutions; these scenarios configure the cultures and societies that we inhabit (Benavides, 1997 and 2011).

In the field of communication, “efficacy” has traditionally been conceived as the fulfilling of objectives pursued through a planned interaction with particular contexts of reception directed from contexts of production (De los Ángeles, 1996). In accordance with an epistemology committed to the values we have defined, in which the objective attitude is replaced by a performative attitude, communication bears a responsibility, due to its implications for identity, politics, culture and society. Thus, the way to define the efficacy and efficiency of communication in any circumstance is to integrate the evaluation of its symbolic influence on the configuring of realities. Thus, the goal of CSC –and as a guide to measure its efficacy– is to achieve social justice and transform violence. Its communication models and methodologies for generating messages and, hence, for assessing results, will be defined from this concept of efficacy.

In this sense, we mean “cultural” efficacy (Nos Aldás, 2007 and 2010b), because CSC requires an integral approach for the concepts of cultural violence and cultural peace (peace cultures) to be added in order to reveal the more subtle effects of communication, and to raise awareness of their consequences. Galtung (1996) describes the link between cultural violence, structural violence and direct violence, and assimilates into the work for peace (peace cultures) all the criteria necessary for defining societies as peaceful beyond the mere absence of war.

In this way, the responsibility for transforming violence is also situated in the cultural and symbolic plane of the construction and legitimization of ideas, because discourses act as the seeds of behaviors and, hence, of actions and social consequences. Developing culturally effective communication involves avoiding, detecting or transforming any form of cultural violence in the production of discourses in the process of transforming those cultural

elements (discursive and communicative) that are counterproductive for equity and justice: delegitimize violence and injustice in all forms in which they manifest in social discourses.

This is about eradicating cultural violence with “alternative” discourses with a basis in social justice criteria. The “alternative communication” concept (Roncagliolo, 1999, cited in Marí Sáez, 2017) aims to alter the structures that we wish to change, and expresses this change through a play on words by replacing the term “alternative”, which is commonly used for this type of discourse.

Therefore, communication that aims for cultural efficacy anticipates the effects of communication on values, beliefs and social behaviors. In particular, in CSC, the focus is on the influence of representations (in terms of cultural and symbolic elements) on the structural transformation of injustices, the potential for popular political engagement and its importance in the long term beyond support for an individual cause.

The tension at the heart of CSC is apparent here in its planning and participatory aspects, in its strategic processes and its creativity. The subversion of traditional epistemologies mainly involves passing from a traditional, individual persuasive approach to one that is collective, cooperative and centered on processes that fit well with community and participatory communication (García López, 2010), because the same techniques and approaches are not valid for all contexts.

Communication with social justice has its own characteristics, and to remain coherent it requires specific voices that aspire to transgress violence through communication based on an ethical testimony that can dialogue with the moral imagination (Lederach, 2007, in París Albert, 2018: 34). This can empower us with “the capacity to imagine ourselves within a network of relations that include our enemies; the ability to feed a paradoxical curiosity that embraces complexity without depending on a dualistic polarity”.

These proposals transgress and subvert what are known as the reductionist imaginaries of classic communication theories (Marí Sáez, 2018), and influence the very idea of communication beyond the mere transmission of information or its conception as a form of persuasion. The tradition of CSC study (Dutta, 2011; Enghel, 2013; Marí Sáez, 2018) redefines its acceptance in terms of long-term social transformation and interaction based on mutual capabilities, underlining the importance of horizontal and dialogical processes and relations more than an instrumental approach. This communication is understood in terms of conversation (as an alternative framework proposed by Darnton and Kirk, 2011); the rhetoric

of invitation is explored (Kaplún, 1998; Foss and Griffin, 1995) beyond a technical, instrumental concept of communication designed out of opacity and imposition.

Thus, CSC is defined by cultural efficacy since its objectives include advocacy, a term used to indicate actions for defense, and the exercising of social or political influence. To explain the term's nuances, it is important to emphasize that advocacy incorporates the transversal responsibility of communication by the issuer, with long-term collective, transformative objectives of understanding and developing its communication, while maintaining the necessary combination of, and dialogue between, actions that promote quality information, actions to raise awareness and public education based on political pedagogy and a culture of solidarity, and a constant drive to influence political, institutional, legislative and media powers (Dogra, 2007: 162 based on Minear 1987; Cohen 2001: 178).

The "cultural efficacy" perspective is thus developed as a tool for use mainly in the work process of the organizational issuers who work with the communication in a planned, strategic way. What is needed is "a strategic theory that can work with human values, not just economic ones [...] which has [...] a long-term focus [...] and yields cultural consequences". All strategic planning must be "communicative" and extend beyond "mere communication management to embrace social transformation" (Pérez González, 2003: 86).

Cultural efficacy aims to broaden the concept and application of communication efficacy through social efficacy. The concept of cultural efficacy influences the long-term political and structural responsibility of this communication. This theoretical tool ("cultural efficacy") develops a transversal perspective rooted in the concept of language performativity (Austin, 1976); developing the communication as an action that involves commitments both in its production and in its reception.

The basis of this change of perspective is reflected in the redefinition by Martínez Guzmán (2003a: 209) of the term "persuasion" in the social awareness processes. What stands out is that "convincing" (as defined in the *Diccionario de uso del Español* by María Moliner, 2001) refers to the ability of the communicator to convince the one receiving the communication, emphasizing the dialogue between reasons and emotions: "raising awareness, as persuasion is a rational sensitization and a sensitized rationality" (Martínez Guzmán, 2003a: 209), and incorporates a "deliberative" imagination that pauses the interpretation process of the interlocutors to allow them to take decisions more consciously, which contrasts with the tendency in advertising logic widespread in the current hegemonic media contexts; instead, the

communication dialogues with the “moral imagination” (Lederach, 2007) which, when faced with the relation with reality, awakens new attitudes and proposals within which they interact.

These ideas match those of Martín Barbero (2003), as cited by Erro (2010), on “cultural sustainability”, referring to the fact that communication with educational intent –which is what communication uses to change imaginaries and concepts– requires “pedagogical and cultural” time, since the tempo of collective learning and cultural-structural transformation runs slower than the technological and bureaucratic changes that we experience.

This idea reveals the difference between marketing and cultural construction processes (Benavides, 1997: 323), which are relational processes, and the construction of citizenry beyond the market’s techniques of articulation. It involves a public, collective communication that energizes the spaces where our identities and priorities are negotiated, the presence of different collectives, their visibility.

Cultural efficacy defines communication on the basis of its compulsory accountability, such as the development of mechanisms to provide us with accountability and which also require us to be accountable (Martínez Guzmán, 2001), requiring us to take responsibility. As Oliver (2001) states, in a study on the role of testimonies, that the relation between interlocutors is subject to *response-ability*, meaning the the capacity to respond and the responsibility implied in that response (Gámez Fuentes *et al*, 2016: 838).

This perspective folds the concept of “communicative solidarity” into CSC, as explained by the epistemological performative shift undertaken by Martínez Guzmán (2001: 199-200), from the theories of the acts of speaking: we struggle to make ourselves understood and understand what others say to us. It is a question of transferring communicative solidarity into “communicative sincerity” (Nos Aldás, 2003) and establishing horizontal discursive relations, from the credibility of the issuer and the confidence of the receiver.

These theoretical-organizational positions imply a recognition of the public as valid interlocutors in the transformation of the structures of injustice. In other words, the incorporation of the analytical and developmental processes of discourses of a perspective based on cultural efficacy demands a discursive sincerity that confers coherence in terms of the established commitments, and this extends not only to the veracity but also the honesty of the issuer towards the receiver based on transparency and ethics.

These premises also enable us to denounce and transform those “social appearance” tendencies that figure in commercial communications that willfully misinterpret social demands and have no corporative coherence (such as in greenwashing or pinkwashing, in reference to organizations that aim to profit by burnishing themselves with a green or pink sheen with no genuine or transversal commitment to a cause), and improve the communication within the setting of their social uses based on a greater knowledge of their consequences and influence.

For this reason, when we talk of the economic aspect of the communication, for commercial issuers as well for social campaigners aiming to gather funds, the cultural consequences can never be forgotten. In these cases, we talk of seeking a cultural “efficacy” in the communication that integrates the symbolic evaluation of their representations into its search processes for economic benefit, to avoid falling into the legitimization or promotion of oppressive social and cultural models.

These forms of contemplating the sciences from positions of constructivism and imperfect peace (Muñoz, 2001; Comins Mingol, 2018) lead us to Communication for Social Change, which applies iterative processes to systematize the successes gained in communication processes that aim to bring about social justice, and by doing so, continues to broaden shared knowledge and cultural knowhow to achieve peace (Nos Aldás *et al.*, 2012).

Comins Mingol (2018) calls this “testimony epistemologies”, whereby we review the theories from the practices, from the ethics and their own knowledge and discourses, seeking out that which is both plural and representative. As well as defending the connection between theory and praxis, Comins Mingol and Muñoz (2013: 23-58) justify an emancipatory philosophy which, in dialogue with Research for Peace, can construct frameworks that empower people to aim for a more just and peaceful future.

This dialogue with Martínez Guzmán’s “participating” proposal fits with CSC approaches (Marí Sáez and Nos Aldás, 2015), because the understanding of situations is only possible through dialogue with its protagonists and with those who have direct experience working within them. The theories can only be confirmed and completed by reiteration, constantly comparing and contrasting them with the practices, and these practices can be improved by the subsequently reinforced theories (Seguí Cosme and Nos Aldás, 2017).

Epistemological innovation in transgressive communication for social change: from immigration to hospitality

In Communication Sciences, the “cultural efficacy” concept enables us to create a complex resistance from the same nucleus of the communication process, since it anticipates the proposals of the Communication Sciences and evaluates their results from the social efficacy perspective. Thus, we observe that CSC needs to be transgressive, along the lines of Mesa *et al.* (2013: 23) and their application of the ideas of Lagarde and de los Ríos (2000 and 2005). Being a communication whose objectives include the transformation of structures that generate violence, CSC needs to incorporate the imagination in order to transgress these established frames.

We propose a communication that is collectively critical and transformative, conceived as “a tool for transformation, not just an instrument for representation” (Nos Aldás, 2002: 318-320). In this section, we deal with the role of critical thought based on the epistemologies developed here, on the learning process (Hooks, 1994) of communication professionals through educational innovation for peace and its complementarity with media and information literacy for all citizens (Nos Aldás and Sampedro, 2017; Farné *et al.*, 2018; Nos Aldás, 2019; Nos Aldás *et al.*, 2019) in order to learn to understand and anticipate the commitments and actions of communication interactions. This connects with Lederach’s (1995) tripartite theory of communication as expression, perception and interpretation, and if we add mutual questioning, we have four elements for our education so that we learn to avoid the problems of communication and, consequently, coexistence, “without dismissing each subtle gesture, look, silence, ensuring that we communicate what we want to say and we see what they want to say to us” (Martínez Guzmán, 2001: 102-103).

This model suggests the importance of the anticipation of discourse performativity, that is, the intentions, ideas, attitudes and values that each act of communication can transmit and mobilize. In terms of diversity, the commitment of a communication can originate from respect or exclusion, recognition or discrimination. In order for the analysis of the performative consequences (cultural) of the discourses to become a procedure, there are three levels that can be identified within a discourse: 1) the ideas that its creativity constructs (how it represents problems, the reality it communicates); 2) the relations that it poses in terms of these realities (with the persons involved); 3) the reactions (commitments) that it arouses. In other words, the attitude of the issuer towards the reality addressed in the

communication; what are the true objectives and intentions of the issuer's communication, what is their idea of the communication and what are their commitments, how are they exercising responsibility?

This application of the epistemological shift in CSC derives from a matrix of criteria that enable us to produce and evaluate public discourse from a cultural efficacy frame based on communication and discourse criteria from a performativity perspective (Nos Aldás, 2007; Nos Aldás *et al.*, 2012; Nos Aldás *et al.*, 2015; Pinazo Calatayud and Nos Aldás, 2016), which has shown the usefulness and applicability of these communication strategies not only for the development of critical communication by a range of social actors (media and communication professionals, government and non-government actors, social movements, legislative and educational actors) (DevReporter, 2016), but also in terms of media education and peace with objectives aimed at global critical citizenry and inclusive political subjects (Nos Aldás, 2019).

Thus, we assume that the narratives proposed from a discourse ethic and "ethical testimony" (Oliver, 2004) anticipate the interaction between political subjects and the activation of a moral sensibility that generates their political involvement, both in terms of the reception and production of narratives. In addition, the experience of the communications of social movements for global social justice has shown the efficacy of transversality, non-violence, collective creativity, cultural sustainability and mobilizing emotions such as indignation and hope, and collective action frames and social justice (Castells, 2015). This way, the violence of the hegemonic frames associated to the figure of the victim are subverted, and the focus on vulnerability and resistance is redefined by agency and the transformative capacity of collective action (Butler *et al.*, 2016). This collective action is often driven by the collective creativity of worldwide social movements for social justice (as systematized by the Boyd and Mitchell project in 2012, and based on García López (2010).

Another element with which to tackle the complexities of the system of injustices and inequalities is a perspective of intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1991; La Barbera, 2017). This concept relates to the intersections arising when different forms of discrimination overlap (gender, ethnicity, class, sexuality, origin, among others) and link to the system of privileges and oppressions of subjects and collectives. From a communication viewpoint, the intersectional perspective enables us to understand overlapping inequalities and so propose discourses for their transformation, because "making visible the violence suffered on the margins of society allows us to explore resistance narratives that attend to the needs of transformation and resignification from a range of positions" (Núñez Puentes *et al.*, 2018: 188).

The pedagogic translation of this CSC proposal into evaluation criteria is presented in Table 1.²

Our research shows that these approaches achieve greater cultural resonance; they dialogue and connect with “established cultural consensuses that are especially active in a particular climate of opinion” (Nos Aldás *et al.*, 2015); meanwhile, protest frameworks, indignation and the interconnections of injustices and personal, social and political actions raise moral sensibility, that is, in line with social psychology, a message can incite a moral judgement in the public that originates in certain emotions that lead to action (Haidt, 2003, in Pinazo Catalayud and Nos Aldás, 2016: 13).

In reference to the various concepts, weaving them together in an analytical model that also converses with the proposals of Strawson (compiled by Martínez Guzmán, 2001: 183), we can observe these testimonial epistemologies in the model developed by Gámez Fuentes and Gómez Nicolau (2017) based on the potential of the “ethical testimony” (Oliver, 2004), which reveals that the discourses contain the relation between those who testify and those who bear witness, the content of the testimony, the narrative construction of vulnerability and resistance, and the link between the specific denunciation and the general framework of the social struggle within which it can be framed.

We create a dialogue between our CSC proposal and what is happening today, and we address an initial exploratory study on the asylum crisis, and the urgency and lack of response (De Andrés *et al.*, 2016). We apply the CSC cultural efficacy analyses to other scenarios such as poverty, hunger and development (Darnton and Kirk, 2011; Dóchas, 2014; ONGAWA, 2019), to the need to design an alternative framework that transforms discourses of hatred towards others that include hospitality and peace cultures, such that immigration and international cooperation are not communicated as unequal realities, because they are interconnected by the structural causes of violence and poverty.

The tradition of communication on these themes has been to link international cooperation to aid and charity frames –proposed as alternative frames of social justice and cooperation (Darnton and Kirk, 2011)– and to address immigration based on frames of threat, representation of the enemy and fear, or the identification of these subjects as “illegals”, among other terms. In line with the theories developed so far, and with concerns on the need to find a creative response and counter-narrative to hate and racism (Poole and Giraud, 2019), these questions would require frames that

2 Tables 1 and 2 are available in the annex, at the end of this article (editor’s note).

represent human rights, social justice, cosmopolitanism, interculturality and hospitality in order to generate solidarity within a highly mediatized context (Chouliaraki, 2013). If we focus on contemporary scenarios around the asylum crisis (migrations from Syria in search of refuge, from North Africa to Spain across the Strait of Gibraltar, etc.) we find the traditional frames and their potential reframing (Table 2).

CSC would be based on a frame of rights, in particular on cosmopolitan citizenry, as a public right to humanity in terms of global civil society, as a right to be different and the freedom to experience interculturality, with the right to engage in mutual questioning between cultures and the right to universal hospitality (Martínez Guzmán, 1999; and 2001: 287). So, the frame that threads together all such concerns is dignity and indignation (Martínez Guzmán, 2001; Sampedro, 2017), taking into account the frame of human rights based on dignity, the development of a people and heterogeneous democracies, the right to be different and to interculturality, and the right of immigrants to hospitality and to be heard (Martínez Guzmán, 2001: 286 and 291), which led this author to propose in 2001 the concept of hospitality to tackle immigration.

In a dialogue between this CSC proposal and examples of current initiatives linked to migrants and refugees that incorporate alternative frames based on hospitality, and in line with Galtung's (1996 and 2003) triangular proposal of violence and peace, we can group these examples in three categories.

Firstly, there are civil society initiatives that aim to transform direct violence by generating humanitarian assistance. Such actions include sea rescue ships piloted by NGOs that pick up migrants in danger of drowning in the Mediterranean, such as Proactiva Open Arms, Sea Watch, and SOS Méditerranée-Doctors Without Borders. These activities aim to save lives and have the effect of offsetting violence directed at migrants. This proposal in defense of human life as a fundamental principle is visible in these NGOs' communication, in which they adopt and generate an alternative frame based on the culture of peace, humanitarianism and the ethics of caring.

Secondly, civil society initiatives to apply political pressure have attempted to transform structural violence. These include a range of mobilizations and actions designed to make a political impact, like denouncing government border policies, especially in the EU, and the injustices that migrants suffer, while promoting actions to welcome migrants and performing inclusive activities. Examples of initiatives aimed at bringing about political and structural change include Stop Mare Mortum, #NoUEfortaleza [No

Fortress Europe], Refugees Welcome, #5MAbrazoDeLosPueblos / #5MEuropeAntiRacist, #WeAreMore. In terms of communication, this type of actions by civil society generates an alternative frame based on solidarity, hospitality and coexistence.

Thirdly, in the transformation of cultural-symbolic violence, which legitimizes and sustains the other forms of violence, there have been actions in the field of information and sensitization by conventional media and social networks that aim to alter discourses of hate and racism. For example, proposals to refute hoaxes and fake news on migrants such as Stop Rumores, BCNAntiRumors and Maldita Migración [Damned Migration], proposals to alter the discourse of hate (#ElOdioNoEsInocente [Hate is not innocent]), and others aimed at making positive stories of coexistence and interculturality more visible, such as Desalambre and “La España de los migrantes” [The Spain of the migrants] from the online daily *Eldiario.es*. These communication actions are heterogeneous, but the common thread is the idea to integrate and promote an alternative frame based on universal, inclusive and emancipatory values, in particular for justice, diversity, dialogue and interculturality.

Conclusions

The ideas expressed in this article are a review and reinforcement of the approaches of communication theories through a concept of cultural efficacy that emphasizes responsibility and the cultural consequences of all communication. Discussion of the epistemology and proposals for research on peace, especially those of Martínez Guzmán, elaborates the nature of cultural violence and analyzes how symbolic violence perpetuates the structural violence that derives from direct violence; how symbolic violence and its representations are constructed and impinge on our actions and relations.

We have described a set of criteria for the peaceful transformation of all types of violence cultures “to make peace”, and these can be applied to, and coincide with, the collective political objectives of Communication for Social Change. This proposal contributes to a science and intersubjective practice that incorporates the recovery of histories and knowledge that have been marginalized, including discourses for positive peace and imperfect peace; the narrative of successful social changes; making visible so many structures and actions that are the result of human suffering.

Cultural efficacy (such as the interpretation and broadening of the type of communicative efficacy needed by Communication for Peace and Social Change) has been defined as a method to evaluate and operate from the performativity of discourses, to anticipate and analyze the effects and commitments (social efficacy) involved in all communication interaction or discourse production, and how discourses can create and reinforce violence or establish active dialogues, reconstruct relations, acknowledge differences and include them. In the case of CSC, communication scenarios are developed that are concerned with social justice from the local to the global stage, and they converse with the newest movements focusing on capacities, commitments and interdependence, the communication of denouncing wrongdoing, monitoring situations and offering solutions; contextualization, visibilization, discoursing with the protagonists and their testimonies, and historical memory.

This article has specifically applied communication approaches to the question of refugees and migration, emphasizing the work of alternative frames that continue to work on deep transformations to change the economy of warfare into social economies that promote solidarity; the result has been the emergence of numerous practices and huge potential to enable us to leave behind an education and social thinking based on cultures of fear to one of defense of cultures based on solidarity and the assumption and acknowledgement of our own vulnerabilities, differences, conflicts and capabilities, based on universal, inclusive and emancipatory values (Mesa *et al.*, 2011) driven by emotions of activation and caring.

The limitations of this research concern the approach of the monograph and restrictions on text length. We therefore decided to dedicate the greater part of this article to the fundamentals of the concept of “cultural efficacy” in Martínez Guzmán’s epistemological proposals rather than to its procedural development. Future lines of investigation could monitor how these proposals develop in light of the tensions in current communication scenarios, delving deeper into the dialogue between these theories of the peaceful transformation of conflicts through communication and special interest groups and the hegemonic understanding of politics, and the role of the mass media and their representation of migrations and the asylum crisis.

There also needs to be a discussion on the paradoxical relations that emerge between the values and attitudes on which these proposals are based, such as the idea of global community, freedom from fear and the need to possess (Darnton and Kirk, 2011), and the hegemonic culture, and how we approach these themes in teaching, with participatory methodologies

based on resonance and cultural sustainability, critical thought and media education (Nos Aldás *et al.*, and 2019; Nos Aldás, 2019).

References

- Arendt, Hannah (1998), “Sobre la violencia”, en *Crisis de la república*, España: Taurus.
- Arendt, Hannah (2005), *La condición humana*, España: Paidós Ibérica.
- Austin, John (1976), *How to do things with words*, Inglaterra: Oxford University Press.
- Benavides, Juan (2011), “La opinión pública y los medios de comunicación social”, en Hortal, Augusto y Etxeberria, Xabier [eds.], *Profesionales y vida pública*, España: Descleé de Brouwer.
- Benavides, Juan (1997), *Lenguaje Publicitario. Hacia un estudio del lenguaje en los medios*, España: Síntesis.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (2000), *La Dominación masculina*, España: Anagrama.
- Boyd, Andrew y Mitchell, Dave [eds.] (2012), *Beautiful Trouble. A toolbox for revolution*, Estados Unidos e Inglaterra: OR Books.
- Butler, Judith *et al.* (2016), *Vulnerability in Resistance*, Inglaterra: Duke University Press.
- Castells, Manuel (2015), *Redes de indignación y esperanza*, España: Alianza.
- Castillo Mateu, Laura (2019), *Mujer y memoria en las series de prime time de la 1 de TVE (2008-2017): La Señora, 14 de Abril. La República, Isabel y El Ministerio del Tiempo* [tesis doctoral], España: Universitat Jaume.
- Chaparro Escudero, Manuel (2015), *Claves para repensar los medios y el mundo que habitamos: la distopía del desarrollo*, Colombia: Desde abajo.
- Chouliaraki, Lilie (2013), *The ironic spectator: Solidarity in the age of post-humanitarianism*, Reino Unido: Polity.
- Comins Mingol, Irene (2018), “Retos epistemológico-normativos de la investigación para la paz”, en *Revista de Pazy Conflictos*, vol. 11, núm. 2, España: Universidad de Granada.
- Comins Mingol, Irene y Martínez Guzmán, Vicent (2010), “Cultura de paz y educación para el desarrollo”, en Burgui, Teresa y Erro, Javier [eds.], *Comunicando para la solidaridad y la cooperación*, España: Foro Comunicación, Educación y Ciudadanía.
- Comins Mingol, Irene y Muñoz, Francisco A. (2013), *Filosofías y praxis de la paz*, España: Icaria.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé (1991), “Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color”, en *Stanford Law Review*, vol. 43, núm. 6, Estados Unidos: Stanford University.
- Darnton, Andrew y Kirk, Martin (2011), *Finding Frames: New ways to engage the UK public in global poverty*, Reino Unido: OXFAM-Bond for International Development. Disponible en: <http://www.framingmymessage.nl/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Finding-Frames-New-ways-to-engage-the-UK-public-in-global-poverty-Bond-2011.pdf> [10 de marzo de 2019].
- De Andrés, Susana *et al.* (2016), “La imagen transformadora. El poder de cambio social de una fotografía: la muerte de Aylan”, en *Comunicar*, vol. 24, núm. 47, España: Universidad de Huelva.
- De los Ángeles, Juan (1996), *Creatividad Publicitaria. Concepto, estrategias y valoración*, España: Ediciones de la Universidad de Navarra (EUNSA).

- DevReporter (2016), "Vademécum de información internacional de calidad", en *Red Internacional de Comunicadores para el Desarrollo DevReporter*. Disponible en: https://coordinadoraongd.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Vademecum_Devreporter.pdf [12 de marzo de 2019].
- Dóchas (2014), *The illustrative guide to Dóchas Code of Conduct on Images and Messages*. Disponible en: <https://dochas.ie/file/illustrative-guide-d%C3%B3chas-code-conduct-images-and-messages>. [12 de marzo de 2019].
- Dogra, Nandita (2007), "Reading NGOs Visually. Implications of visual images for NGO management", en *Journal of International Development*, vol. 19, núm. 2, Reino Unido: Wiley.
- Dutta, Mohan (2011), *Communicating Social Change: Structure, Culture, and Agency*, Estados Unidos: Routledge.
- Engel, Florencia (2013), "Communication, Development and Social Change: Future alternatives", en Wilkins, Karin *et al.* [eds.], *Global Communication: New Agendas in Communication*, Inglaterra y Estados Unidos: Routledge.
- Entman, Robert (2007), "Framing Bias: Media in the Distribution of Power", en *Journal of Communication*, vol. 57, núm. 1, Estados Unidos: International Communication Association.
- Erro Sala, Javier (2010), "Comunicación, cooperación internacional para el desarrollo y ONGD: un modelo de trabajo desde la educación y la cultura", en Erro Sala, Javier y Burgui, Teresa [eds.], *Comunicando para la Solidaridad y la Cooperación*. Cómo salir de la encrucijada, España: Foro de Comunicación, Educación y Ciudadanía.
- Fairclough, Norman (1989), *Language and Power*, Inglaterra: Longman.
- Farné, Alessandra *et al.* (2018), "Communication towards equality for future media professionals: Implementing social awareness through a Cultural Efficacy Festival", en *Congreso Internacional "Trial and Error"*, Portugal: Universidade do Minho.
- Farné, Alessandra y López Ferrández, Javier (2016), "Comunicación para la Paz: una propuesta pedagógica para el cambio social", en *Opción. Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales*, vol. 32, núm. 9, Venezuela: Universidad del Zulia.
- Forastelli, Fabricio (2013), "Peace Profile: Vicent Martínez Guzmán", en *Peace Review: A Journal of Social Justice*, vol. 25, núm. 3. DOI: 10.1080/10402659.2013.816573 Disponible en: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10402659.2013.816573> [15 de marzo de 2019].
- Foss, Sonia y Griffin, Cindy (1995), "Beyond Persuasion: A Proposal for an Invitational Rhetoric", en *Communication Monographs*, vol. 62, núm. 1, Estados Unidos: National Communication Association.
- Galtung, Johan (2003), *Paz por medios pacíficos. Paz y conflicto, desarrollo y civilización*, España: Bakeaz-Gernika Gogoratuz.
- Galtung, Johan (1996), "Cultural Violence", en *Peace by Peaceful Means*, Inglaterra: Sage.
- Gámez Fuentes, María José y Gómez Nicolau, Emma (2017), "El 'testimonio ético' como modelo analítico en la comunicación para el cambio social", en *Actas CIAIQ2017*, 6º Congreso Ibero-americano en investigación cualitativa, España: Ludomedia.
- Gámez Fuentes, María José *et al.* (2016), "Celebrities, violencia de género y derechos de las mujeres: ¿hacia una transformación del marco de reconocimiento?", en *Revista Latina de Comunicación Social*, núm. 71, España: Universidad de La Laguna.

- García López, Marcial (2010), “La comunicación como escenario de empoderamiento ciudadano y para la construcción colectiva de cultura de paz. Pensando otra publicidad social”, en Sánchez, Luis y Codorniu, Juan [eds.], *Movimiento asociativo y cultura de paz: una mirada desde Andalucía*, España: Colección Eireney Universidad de Granada.
- Giri, Ananta (2006), “Cosmopolitanism and Beyond: Towards a Multiverse of Transformations”, en *Development and Change*, vol. 37. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-7660.2006.00524.x Disponible en: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-7660.2006.00524.x> [12 de marzo de 2019].
- Goffman, Erving (1974), *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*, Estados Unidos: Harvard University Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1984), “El concepto de poder de Hannah Arendt”, en *Perfiles Filosófico-políticos*, España: Taurus.
- Haidt, Jonathan (2003), “The moral emotions”, en Davidson, Richard *et al.* [eds.], *Handbook of affective sciences*, Reino Unido: Oxford University Press.
- Hall, Stuart [ed.] (1997), *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*, Inglaterra: Sage.
- Hooks, Bell (1994), *Teaching to Transgress. Education as the practice of freedom*, Inglaterra: Routledge.
- Kaplún, Mario (1998), *Pedagogía de la comunicación*, España: La Torre.
- La Barbera, María Caterina (2017), “Interseccionalidad”, en *Eunomia*, núm. 12, España: Universidad Carlos III.
- Lagarde y de los Ríos, Marcela (2005), “Ética y política alternativa”, en *Para mis socias de la vida. Claves feministas*, España: Horas y Horas.
- Lagarde y de los Ríos, Marcela (2000), “Claves feministas para la autoestima”, en *Cuadernos Inacabados*, núm. 39, España: Horas y Horas.
- Lakoff, George (2004), *Don't Think of an Elephant: Know Your Values and Frame the Debate*, Estados Unidos: Chelsea Green.
- Lederach, John (2007), *La imaginación moral: El arte y el alma de la construcción de la paz*, España: Bakeaz.
- Marí Sáez, Víctor Manuel (2018), “Análisis de los movimientos-red contemporáneos desde una perspectiva comunicacional y freiriana. Desbordamientos, transformaciones y sujetos colectivos”, en *Utopía y Praxis Latinoamericana*, vol. 23, núm. Extra 3, Venezuela: Universidad delZulia.
- Marí Sáez, Víctor Manuel (2017), “Towards a Critical Political Economy of Indicators. Measuring and Evaluating “Alteratively” Communication, Development and Social Change”, en *Commons. Revista De Comunicación y Ciudadanía Digital*, vol. 6, núm. 1. DOI: 10.25267/COMMONS.2017.v6.i1.01 Disponible en: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319564897_Editorial_Hacia_una_Economia_Politica_Critica_del_indicador_Medir_y_evaluar_alterativamente_la_comunicacion_el_desarrollo_y_el_cambio_social [12 de marzo de 2019].
- Marí Sáez, Víctor Manuel (2012), “Building knowledge from the margins: information, knowledge and social movements”, en *Transinformação*, vol. 24, núm. 1. DOI: 10.1590/S0103-37862012000100006 Disponible en: http://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0103-37862012000100006 [12 de marzo de 2019].
- Marí Sáez, Víctor Manuel y Nos Aldás, Eloísa (2015), “Prólogo”, en *Comunicación para el Cambio Social. La participación y el empoderamiento como base para el desarrollo mundial*, España: Icaria.

- Martín Barbero, Jesús (2014), "Jesús Martín Barbero: conceptos clave en su obra. Parte 1: Mediaciones", en *Pensadores.co* [video]. Disponible en: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NveV5ScaZHg> [12 de marzo de 2019].
- Martín Barbero, Jesús (2003), *La educación desde la comunicación*, Colombia: Norma.
- Martín Barbero, Jesús (1998), "Heredando el futuro: pensar la educación desde la comunicación", en *Cultura y Educación / Culture and Education*, vol. 10, núm. 1, España: Taylor and Francis.
- Martín Barbero, Jesús (1987), *De los medios a las mediaciones: comunicación, cultura y hegemonía*, España: Gustavo Gili.
- Martínez Guzmán, Vicent (2015a), "Epílogo. Hacer las paces en tiempos de crisis: Veinte años trabajando para hacer las paces en la Universitat Jaume I", en Nos Aldás, Eloísa *et al.* [eds.], *#comunicambio: Comunicación y Sociedad Civil para el Cambio Social / #com4change: Communication and Civil Society for Social Change*, España: Fragua.
- Martínez Guzmán, Vicent (2005a), "La filosofía para la paz como racionalidad práctica", en *Investigaciones fenomenológicas: Anuario de la Sociedad Española de Fenomenología*, núm. 4, España: Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia (UNED).
- Martínez Guzmán, Vicent (2005b), *Podemos hacer las paces. Reflexiones éticas tras el 11-S y el 11-M*, España: Desclée de Brower.
- Martínez Guzmán, Vicent (2003a), "Discurso y sensibilización: entre la indignación y la esperanza", en Benet, Vicente y Nos Aldás, Eloísa [eds.], *La publicidad en el Tercer Sector. Tendencias y perspectivas de la comunicación solidaria*, España: Icaria.
- Martínez Guzmán, Vicent (2003b), "Políticas para la Diversidad: Hospitalidad contra Extranjería", en *Convergencia Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, vol. 10, núm. 33, México: Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México.
- Martínez Guzmán, Vicent (2001), *Filosofía para hacer las paces*, España: Icaria.
- Martínez Guzmán, Vicent (2000), "Saber Hacer las Paces. Epistemologías de los Estudios para la Paz", en *Convergencia Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, núm. 23, México: Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México.
- Martínez Guzmán, Vicent (1999), "Els drets humans, la pau local, la pau global: a manera d'introducció", en *Anuari de l'Agrupació Borrianenca de Cultura*, núm. 10, España: Agrupació Borrianenca de Cultura.
- Mesa, Manuela *et al.* (2013), *Visibles y transgresoras. Narrativas y propuestas visuales para la paz y la igualdad*, España: Centro de Educación e Investigación para la Paz (CEIPAZ). Disponible en: <http://www.ceipaz.org/visiblesytransgresoras/> [11 de julio de 2018].
- Mies, Maria y Shiva, Vandana (1997), *Ecofeminismo: teoría, crítica y perspectivas*, España: Icaria.
- Mignolo, Walter (2010), *Desobediencia epistémica. Retórica de la modernidad, lógica de la colonialidad y gramática de la descolonialidad*, Argentina: Ediciones del Signo.
- Miner, Larry (1987). "The other mission of NGOs: education and advocacy", en *World Development*, vol. 15, supl. 1, Reino Unido: Elsevier.
- Moliner, María (2001), *Diccionario de uso del español*, España: Gredos.
- Muñoz, Francisco (2001), *La paz imperfecta*, España: Instituto de la paz y los conflictos, Universidad de Granada.

- Nos Aldás, Eloísa (2019), "Learning with 'Generation Like' about digital global citizenship: a case study from Spain", en Bourn, Douglas [ed.], *Bloomsbury Handbook on Global Education and Learning*, Inglaterra: Bloomsbury.
- Nos Aldás, Eloísa (2013), "Public discourses for nonkilling societies. Peace Research and Communication Trends", en Evans, Joám [ed.], *Nonkilling Media*, Estados Unidos: Center for Global Nonkilling, Creighton University.
- Nos Aldás, Eloísa (2010a), "La comunicación y los discursos público", en *Investigación para la paz: estudios filosóficos*, España: Icaria.
- Nos Aldás, Eloísa (2010b), "Comunicación, cultura y educación para la solidaridad y el desarrollo", en Erro Sala, Javier y Burgui, Teresa [eds.], *Comunicando para la Solidaridad y la Cooperación. Cómo salir de la encrucijada*, España: Foro de Comunicación, Educación y Ciudadanía.
- Nos Aldás, Eloísa (2007), *Lenguaje publicitario y discursos solidarios: Eficacia publicitaria, ¿eficacia cultural?*, España: Icaria.
- Nos Aldás, Eloísa (2003), "Discurso publicitario y sensibilización en las ONGD: de la función social de la publicidad a la responsabilidad de la comunicación social", en Benet, Vicente y Nos Aldás, Eloísa [eds.], *La publicidad en el Tercer Sector: tendencias y perspectivas de la comunicación solidaria*, España: Icaria.
- Nos Aldás, Eloísa (2002), "Reseña de 'Filosofía para hacer las paces' de Vicent Martínez Guzmán", en *Convergencia Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, vol. 9, núm. 27, México: Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México.
- Nos Aldás, Eloísa y Farné, Alessandra (2018), "El relato feminista en la cultura popular digital actual: tensiones entre la racionalidad publicitaria y un enfoque político transversal", en Marí Sáez, Víctor y Ceballos Castro, Gonzalo [coords.], *Desbordes comunicativos. Comunicación, ciudadanía y transformación social*, España: Fragua.
- Nos Aldás, Eloísa et al. (2019), "Justicia social, culturas de paz y competencias digitales: comunicación para una ciudadanía crítica global en la educación superior", en *Revista Internacional de Educación para la Justicia Social*, vol. 8, núm. 1, España: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
- Nos Aldás, Eloísa et al. (2012), "La eficacia cultural de la comunicación de las ONGD: los discursos de los movimientos sociales actuales como revisión", en *CIC Cuadernos de Información y Comunicación*, vol. 17, España: Universidad Complutense de Madrid.
- Nos Aldás, Eloísa y Santolino, Montse (2015), "La Investigación en Comunicación y Cooperación en los nuevos escenarios de movilización social: ONGD, objetivos de justicia social y eficacia cultural", en *Revista de la Asociación Española de Investigación de la Comunicación*, vol. 2, núm. 4, España: Universidad de Santiago de Compostela.
- Nos Aldás, Eloísa et al. (2015), "Evaluación e indicadores de eficacia cultural. Un análisis crítico desde los criterios de éxito de la comunicación actual de los movimientos sociales en España: la resonancia cultural en el caso de la PAH", en Chaparro, Manuel [ed.], *Medios de proximidad: participación social y políticas públicas*, España: Fragua- COMandalucía.
- Nos Aldás, Eloísa y Sampedro, Víctor (2017), "Educación mediática crítica y participativa: Evolución de la comunicación cultura, nuevas narrativas y dietética digital", en *Actas del III Congreso Internacional de Educación Mediática y Competencia Digital*, España: Universidad de Valladolid, Campus Segovia.

- Núñez Puente, Sonia *et al.* (2018), “Comunicación, violencia de género y prácticas de resistencia: narrativas innovadoras para un cambio social”, en *Teknokultura*, vol. 15, núm. 2, España: Universidad Complutense de Madrid.
- Oliver, Kelly (2004), “Witnessing and Testimony”, en *Parallax*, vol. 10, núm. 1, Reino Unido: Taylor and Francis.
- ONGAWA (2019), *Nadie dijo que fuera fácil. Un relato colectivo, optimista y cuestionador sobre cómo las ONGD implicamos a la ciudadanía*. Disponible en: <https://ongawa.org/nadiedijoquefuerafacil/> [12 de marzo de 2019].
- París Albert, Sonia (2018), “Hacia una reconstrucción de las paces creativas para la ciudadanía global”, en *Revista de paz y conflictos*, vol. 11, núm. 1, España: Universidad de Granada.
- PérezGonzález, Rafael Alberto (2003), “¿Porqué necesitamos una nueva teoría estratégica?”, en Benavides, Juan y Villagra García, Nuria [eds.], *Públicos, instituciones y problemas en la comunicación del nuevo milenio*, España: Fundación General de la Universidad Complutense.
- Pinazo Calatayud, Daniel y Nos Aldás, Eloísa (2016), “Developing Moral Sensitivity Through Protest Scenarios in International NGOs’ Communication”, en *Communication Research*, vol. 43, núm. 1. DOI: 10.1177/0093650213490721 Disponible en: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0093650213490721> [12 de marzo de 2019].
- Poole, Elizabeth y Giraud, Eva (2019), “Right-Wing Populism and Mediated Activism: Creative Responses and Counter-Narratives Special Collection”, en *Open Library of Humanities*, vol. 5, núm. 1. DOI: 10.16995/olh.438 Disponible en: <https://olh.openlibhums.org/articles/10.16995/olh.438/> [14 de marzo de 2019].
- Puleo, Alicia H. (2011), *Ecofeminismo para otro mundo posible*, España: Cátedra.
- Rodríguez, Clemencia y Moreno, Martha (2016), “Propuesta para un viraje en el estudio de los medios en Las Márgenes”, en *OBETS: Revista de Ciencias Sociales*, vol. 11, núm. 1, España: Universidad de Alicante.
- Roncagliolo, Rafael (1988), “Las redes de cooperación y la radio comunitaria”, en Chaparro, Manuel [ed.], *La democratización de los medios*, España: Diputación de Sevilla/EMA-RTV.
- Sampedro, Víctor (2015), *El Cuarto Poder en Red*, España: Icaria.
- Seguí Cosme, Salvador y Nos Aldás, Eloísa (2017), “Bases epistemológicas y metodológicas para definir indicadores de eficacia cultural en la comunicación del cambio social”, en *Commons. Revista de Comunicación y Ciudadanía Digital*, vol. 6, núm. 2, España: Universidad de Cádiz.
- Sousa Santos, Boaventura de (2011), “Epistemologías del Sur”, en *Utopía y Praxis Latinoamericana*, vol. 16, Venezuela: Universidad del Zulia.
- TuMe, Thomas (2015), *Comunicación para el cambio social. La participación y el empoderamiento como base para el desarrollo mundial*, España: Icaria.

Annex

Table 1

Communication and evaluation criteria for cultural efficacy

Criteria	Description
1. Non-violence	Avoid all types of violence, even symbolic. Care needs to be taken when dealing with stereotypes; avoid ridiculing, blaming, generalizing and adopting condescending attitudes, etc.
2. Recognition	Recognition and acknowledgement of the other person from a perspective of equality despite differences, with empathy based on universal, inclusive and emancipatory values.
3. Transgression	Transform hegemonic representation frames that perpetuate oppression; promote new imaginaries through creativity and innovation.
4. Interseccionalidad	Be aware of the crossovers and overlaps in questions of gender, ethnicity and origin, class, sexuality, age, functional diversity.
5. "Inspiration"	Foment communication with proposals that provide reference models inspired by equality, and an invitation to action and emancipation.

Source: own elaboration.

Table 2

The main frames on the asylum crisis and migrations

Traditional frame	Alternative frame
Culture of defense (military economy)	Cultures of peace: non-violence, humanitarianism, the ethics of caring (social economy based on solidarity)
Culture of fear (border policies)	Culture of solidarity (policies of hospitality and coexistence in diversity)
Values based on security, conservation, tradition (nationalism)	Universal, inclusive, emancipatory values (critical cosmopolitan citizenry)

Source: based on Martínez Guzmán (2003) and Mesa *et al.* (2013).

Eloísa Nos Aldás. Full Professor at the Universitat Jaume I de Castellón (UJI), in the Department of Communication Sciences, Faculty of Human and Social Sciences. Lines of investigation: communication, civil society and social change. Recent publications: Pinazo Calatayud, Daniel, Nos Aldás, Eloísa and Agut Nieto, Sonia (2020), “Positive and negative communication in social activism”, in *Comunicar*, n° 62, Spain: Universidad de Huelva; Nos Aldás, Eloísa (2019), “From grassroots action to public discourses of cultural peace”, in Iranzo, Amador and Farné, Alessandra [coords.] (2019), *Communication for social change: proposals for action*, Spain: Tirant Lo Blanch; Nos Aldás, Eloísa and Santolino, Montse (2015), “Research in Communication and Cooperation in the new social mobilization scenarios: NGODs, social justice and cultural efficacy goals”, in *Revista de la Asociación Española de Investigación de la Comunicación*, vol. 2, n°. 4, Spain: Spanish Association for Communication Research.

Alessandra Farné. Lecturer and researcher at the Interuniversity Institute of Social Development and Peace of Universitat Jaume I of Castellón (UJI). Farné has a Masters and Doctorate in Peace, Conflict and Development Studies, and graduated in Public Relations. Lines of investigation: communication for social change, NGO communications and social movements, online communication, media education. Recent publications: Farné, Alessandra and López Ferrández, F. Javier (2016), “Communication for Peace: a pedagogical proposal for social change”, in *Opción. Revista de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales*, vol. 32, n°. 9, Venezuela: Universidad del Zulia; Iranzo, Amador and Farné, Alessandra [coords.] (2019), *Communication for social change: proposals for action*, Spain: Tirant Lo Blanch; Núñez Puente, Sonia, Fernández Romero, Diana and Farné, Alessandra (2018), “Communication, gender-based violence and resistance: innovative narratives for social change”, in *Teknokultura*, vol. 15, n°. 2, Spain: Universidad Complutense de Madrid.