Fanatics and Frowners:
Struggling discourses of fandom on Wieisdemol.com

Bachelor Thesis
Ruud Dielen
5484359
Media & Cultuur
Thesis tutor: Anne Kustritz
June 2016 – 2017 (4th term)
Submission date: 23 – 06 – 2017
Word Count: 9,040 words

Universiteit Utrecht

Table of Contents

Abstract

This thesis has looked into Wieisdemol.com, a fan forum of the Dutch television show *Wie is de Mol?*. A discourse analysis was done to see how different academic discourses of fandom interact, combine and/or contradict each other. By analysing the firsts posts of all the discussion threads, this thesis argues for a categorization of its fan practices in four categories: 1) theory and speculation, 2) the production and consumption of fan content, 3) the maintaining of WIDM canon and 4) the evaluation of the quality of WIDM. Within the last category, one specific discussion thread dedicated to giving feedback was analysed. All the forum posts within this discussion thread were examined and analysed through the lens of critical and anti-fandom. Lastly, the same discussion thread was analysed to see how fans themselves makes sense of different forms of fandom. By building on works, theories and concepts of active fan practices, non-fandom and anti-fandom, this thesis argues that these seemingly separated discourses can be used to help understand each other. The thesis positions itself in the struggle between the academic discourses and demonstrates that within one community the practices of the different discourses are closely tied. The main purpose of this thesis is to argue for more research into the relation between negative and positive fan practices and see how they relate to each other within one specific (fan) audience. This will help to understand the complex relation between consumer and text better.

Honours Thesis

This thesis was written as part of the bachelor Media and Culture, with specialization in Television Studies and within the Humanities Honours Programme of Utrecht University. Therefore, there were some extra requirements this thesis had to fulfil and this section elaborates where the Honours related aspects of this thesis can be found.

First of all, the word count of the thesis had to be above average. This extra space was used to do a larger analysis of the corpus. Furthermore, within the method chapter, the chosen method (discourse analysis) is elaborated upon. Not only is explained why the chosen method was productive for this thesis, but the history of the concept of 'discourse' is discussed elaborately. It is also argued why the discourse theory of Foucault, Laclau and Mouffe was useful, in contrary to Fairclough's notion of discourse analysis. The thesis mainly provides extra depth and a grounded argumentation why the discourse analysis is useful for this research.

Introduction

For a long time, fandom has been a popular topic of research. In 1992 one of the most influential books, *Textual Poachers: Television Fans and Participatory Culture* by Henry Jenkins, was published, where the author wrote:

> The fan still constitutes a scandalous category in contemporary culture […]. Whether viewed as a religious fanatic, a psychopathic killer, a neurotic fantasist, or a lust-crazed groupie, the fan remains a "fanatic" or false worshipper, whose interests are fundamentally alien to the realm of "normal" cultural experience and whose mentality is dangerously out of touch with reality.[1]

The image of fans being religious fanatics, killers, fantasists or worshippers is not valid within the field of fan studies, as since Jenkins' publication a lot of concepts of fans and their practices have been developed, resulting in a broad range of ways to understand fandom.

This thesis examines how one particular fan community, that of Wieisdemol.com, combines different academically developed discourses of fandom. Wieisdemol.com is one of the biggest online fan sites of the Dutch television show WIE IS DE MOL?.[2] In this TV show ten contestants participate in challenges to collect money which one of them eventually wins. One of the contestants, 'the Mole', has secretly been instructed by the production team to sabotage the challenges. At the end of each episode, contestants fill in a quiz on the identity of the Mole, and the contestant with the lowest score will be eliminated from the show. The winner is the contestant who unmasks the Mole in the final test in the final episode. The show has been around since 1999 but is still immensely popular. In 2015 and 2016, WIDM ranked 5th in most watched TV shows of the year.[3] The show's most recent 17th season, broadcast January - March 2017, had the highest average number of viewers (2,5 million) from all of WIDM's seasons.[4]

The show is not only popular on television, but has a huge online following as well. One of the places where fans meet is Wieisdemol.com: an Internet forum where users can speculate on episodes, contestants and challenges and the possible identity of the Mole. Besides discussion, the website users create fan content, have their own betting games and organize other fan related activities around WIDM. Wieisdemol.com is part of a larger Internet forum named Realitynet, which also focuses on other TV shows, sport events and more.[5] The site was founded in 2002, the same year the third season of WIDM was broadcast. The show

---

[1] Henry Jenkins, *Textual Poachers: Television Fans & Participatory Culture* (New York, NY: Routledge, 1992), 15 - 16.

[2] WIE IS DE MOL? translates into 'Who is the Mole?' and is from now on abbreviated in this thesis as 'WIDM'.

[3] Stichting Kijk Onderzoek, TV Kijkcijfers, "Jaar Top 100 Exclusief Sport," https://kijkonderzoek.nl/component /com_kijkcijfers/Itemid,133/file,n1-1-1-p.

[4] De Telegraaf, Film en Uitgaan, "Bijna drie miljoen kijkers Wie is de Mol," http://www.telegraaf.nl /filmenuitgaan/rtv/27783891/__Bijna_drie_miljoen_kijkers_WIDM__.html.

[5] Realitynet, "Startpagina", http://realitynet.org/index.php.

got an all-time visitor high in 2017: after the 8th episode was broadcast, 5,150 unique visitors were online at the same time.[6]

Even though Wieisdemol.com is the biggest online fan community of the show, there has been a lot of negativity on the forum in recent years, with a big part of the users critiquing the show, leading to a negative vibe on the forum. Or as one forum users says:

It's just too bad that this forum has mainly become a place for complaining.[7]

Within fan studies a lot of different concepts of fandom have been developed, to describe both positive and negative fan practices. Jenkins, for example, has examined the practices of active, online fans of the TV show TWIN PEAKS.[8] Others scholars, as explained in the first chapter of this thesis, have focused on these active fan practices as well. However, Elizabeth S. Bird notes that she fears that an "overemphasis on online audience creativity" ignores other questions on media audiences and she argues for more research into other forms of audience, whether they are active or not.[9] An example of this is Jonathan Gray's concepts of non- and anti-fandom, where he argues for more research into consumers who are not fans.[10] This short description shows that there are different forms – or discourses – on fandom and that they seem fairly separated. The academic relevance of this thesis is that uses concepts and theories of these different 'sides' of fandom to analyse Wieisdemol.com. It positions itself between the different discourses to show that different concepts on fandom can be used to help understand each other. Wieisdemol.com serves as a productive corpus as it incorporates both the negative and positive fan practices and as it is a very popular forum related to a very popular TV show.

The following main question has been formulated: How does the fan discourse constituted by users on Wieisdemol.com show that opposing academic discourses of fandom interact? To answer this question, three sub questions have been developed:

1. How do users of Wieisdemol.com express different forms of active fandom?
2. How do users of Wieisdemol.com perform critical forms of fandom?
3. How do users of Wieisdemol.com define different categories of fandom?

---

[6] Ibidem.

[7] The original Dutch translations of all the quotes have been documented in Attachment C. For the translation of this citation, see Quote 1 in Attachment C; '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen,*' http://www.wieisdemol.com /forum/index.php?topic=60039.20.

[8] Henry Jenkins, "Do You Enjoy Making the Rest of Us Feel Stupid: Alt.tv.twinpeaks, the Trickster Author, and Viewer Mastery," in *Fans, Bloggers, and Gamers: Exploring Participatory Culture* (New York, NY, 2006), 115 - 134.

[9] Elizabeth S. Bird, "Are We All Produsers Now? Convergence and Media Audience Practices," *Cultural Studies* 25, no. 4–5 (2011): 508 - 509.

[10] Jonathan Gray, "New Audiences, New Textualities: Anti-Fans and Non-Fans," *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 6, no. 1 (2003): 64 - 81.

To answer these questions, a discourse analysis has been done. By looking at the first post(s) of all the discussion threads on WIDM 2017 and all the posts in one of the discussion threads dedicated to evaluating the show, this thesis shows that the discourse and concept on anti-fandom, can be used to reflect on negativity within an active fan community, showing that these practices are not as separated as they seem.

The first chapter of this thesis serves as theoretical framework, discussing what different academic discourses of fandom exist. In the second chapter, the method of discourse analysis is explained, including an operationalization of the steps taken to perform the analysis. In Chapter 3, the analysis has been done where is argued that the concepts of active fandom, critical fandom and anti-fandom can be used to help understand each other.

Chapter 1: Theoretical Framework

This chapter argues for the position of this thesis between different academic discourses on fandom. The chapter argues for three main categories within the discourses and its practices: active fandom, non-fandom and critical (anti-)fandom. It's argued that this thesis positions itself between these categories and that the analysed fan practices on Wieisdemol.com combine elements from all these different discourses – thereby showing that these academic discourses are highly dependent on each other.

Online Fan Practices

Within the discourse of active fandom, different fan practices have been recognized. In the early years of the Internet, Henry Jenkins already identified different fan activities in his research on online fans of TWIN PEAKS. Jenkins identified different reading practices and interpretive strategies, for example the formulation of plot theories, search for intertextual relations and the (imagined) relationship with TWIN PEAKS' author David Lynch.[11] In 2006, Jenkins further examined online fan communities and practices, this time on SURVIVOR. He describes the fan community of the Internet forum SurvivorSucks as a collective intelligence: a community combining the knowledge and expertise of individual members to collectively discuss and theorize on the show's development.[12]

The discussion and theorization of plot developments is also identified by Jason Mittell as one of the fan practices of *Lostpedia,* a fan site of LOST.[13] Mittell, besides theorization and discussion, recognizes other fan practices as well, as the creation of fan content.[14]

Mark Andrejevic in his discussion of the online TV forum *Television Without Pity*, notices the same practice: online viewers make a show entertaining by doing innovative, creative work to poke fun at the show.[15] Another role of the forum – and of those creative and mocking fan practices – is that it provides feedback for the producers.[16] The users who post feedback, don't just want to be recognized but want to be seen as "savvy viewers" who don't fall for the producers' manipulations.[17] Andrejevic concludes that these savvy viewers who post feedback also know that their contributions aren't taken seriously by the producers. This

---

[11] Jenkins, "Do You Enjoy Making the Rest of Us Feel Stupid," 119.

[12] Henry Jenkins, "Spoiling *Survivor*: The Anatomy of a Knowledge Community," in *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide* (New York: New York University Press, 2006), 26 – 32.

[13] Jason Mittell, "Sites of Participation: Wiki Fandom and the Case of Lostpedia," *Transformative Works and Cultures* 3 (2009), paragraph 2.12.

[14] Idem, paragraphs 2.21 – 2.25.

[15] Mark Andrejevic, "Watching Television Without Pity: The Productivity of Online Fans," *Television & New Media* 9, no. 1 (2008): 32.

[16] Idem, 33.

[17] Idem, 37.

knowledge of their lack of power, and explicitly referring to that in their feedback, separates them from the 'naïve' who believe the Internet can cause revolutions.[18]

Costello and Moore identified the above mentioned fan practices of as well, and categorized them on different levels of activity. At the lowest levels, they identify TV show viewers who look for factual information, gossip or insider news but don't post or create anything themselves.[19] The production and consumption of fan fiction, the maintenance of unofficial fan content and the creating of an accepting fan community, are practices found on a higher level.[20] On the highest level of activity, Costello and Moore argue, are fans who see the Internet as a means to interact with the show: influencing the show, exerting power over the producers and, ultimately, controlling the life and death of a series.[21]

John Fiske sees these kind of fan practices in relation to fan communities. He argues that fan communities have some main characteristics, and those can be divided in three categories: discrimination and distinction, productivity and participation, and capital accumulation.[22] Within the category of discrimination and distinction, Fiske argues that the fandom's cultural taste and practices are created by social rather than through individual differences.[23] Fiske means that the hierarchies between different texts (what text is deemed better by the fans?) and social hierarchies within fandom (which fan is more important?) is based on the processes found in popular culture.[24] The second category of Fiske is focused on productivity and participation, where he proposes three main ways fans are productive: through a) making meaning of their own identity based on the text, b) actively creating a fan 'community' and c) creating fan texts.[25] Within the category of capital accumulation Fiske argues that fans use the knowledge they have over a text to participate with the original product – and the more knowledge over the product (the text), the more power fans have within the community.[26]

Theorizing and discussing, the creation and maintaining of fan content, the providing of feedback and hope for influencing television are identified fan practices, together creating a discourse characterized by an image of a highly active and enthusiastic fan. However, on the other end of activity, a passive viewer who doesn't actively participate with a television show can be recognized. Jonathan Gray describes these users as 'non-fans': viewers or readers

---

[18] Idem, 39.
[19] Victor Costello, and Barbara Moore, "Cultural Outlaws: An Examination of Audience Activity and Online Television Fandom," *Television & New Media* 8, no. 2 (2007): 132 – 133.
[20] Idem, 134.
[21] Idem, 137 – 138.
[22] John Fiske, "The Cultural Economy of Fandom," in *The Adoring Audience: Fan Culture and Popular Media*, edited by Lisa A. Lewis (New York, NY: Routledge, 1992), 34.
[23] Idem, 37.
[24] Idem, 36 – 37.
[25] Idem, 37 – 39.
[26] Idem, 43.

who consume a text in without intense involvement – and argues for more research on them.[27] Elizabeth S. Bird notes, too, that the majority of the audience exists of does not consist of what she calls produsers: Internet users who actively produce or contribute to existing content, and that an overemphasis on these types of fans might be dangerous.[28]

Critical and anti-fandom

This thesis has not only looked into how Wieisdemol.com's fan practices resemble the discourse of the highly active fan, but examined how other critical or negative fan practices interact with it. In his highly-influential work *Textual Poachers*, Henry Jenkins notes:

> organized fandom is, perhaps first and foremost, an institution of theory and criticism, a semistructured space where competing interpretations and evaluations of common texts are proposed, debated, and negotiated and where readers speculate about the nature of the mass media and their own relationship to it.[29]

Criticism is then, according to Jenkins, an important aspect of fandom, as fans believe they have 'the moral right to criticize' when their show doesn't meet with their expectations.[30] Jenkins focuses on fans' reading practices and how those interpretations represent a gender-specific, feminine way of reading the text.[31]

Building on Jenkins' notion of fan criticism, Lesley Goodman did research on the negative fan reactions on the epilogue of J.K. Rowling's *Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows*. He points out how disappointed fans "fix" the narrative through fan fiction, thereby embracing the fictional universe but disregarding the author's authority.[32] Goodman claims that fans are aware of the money-driven forces within the media and that they know that these forces can obstruct authors or producers. Therefore, fan complaints embody both the acceptance of and the resistance to the capitalist entertainment industry.[33] Where the previously discussed active fans were driven by admiration for the show, the critical fans seem driven by disappointment.

While Jenkins and Goodman discuss how fans behave, Jonathan Gray developed the concept of 'anti-fans'. Anti-fans dislike a show and while they do not know everything (while an 'active' fan does), they know enough to give a grounded, mainly negative, argumentation for

---

[27] Gray, "New Audiences, New Textualities," 74.
[28] Bird, "Are We All Produsers Now?", 504 – 505, 512.
[29] Jenkins, *Textual Poachers*, 88.
[30] Idem, 90.
[31] Idem, 91.
[32] Lesley Goodman, "Disappointing Fans: Fandom, Fictional Theory, and the Death of the Author," *The Journal of Popular Culture* 48, no. 4 (2015): 5 - 7.
[33] Idem, 13.

their dislike.[34] Gray notes that anti-fans acquire their knowledge through distant reading (while fans often perform a close reading) and through the consumption of paratexts (e.g. reviews on or media talk about the text).[35] Harman and Jones also did research on anti-fans. They concluded that within the anti-fan community of the *Fifty Shades of Grey* trilogy, the readers got most of their pleasure from "hate-reading."[36] Anti-fans discussed the apparent low taste level of the trilogy and its assumed 'real' fans. Their collective hate of the trilogy, accompanied by the shared values of taste, offered great pleasure for these anti-fans.[37]

Where the enthusiastic fan is driven by love, admiration and passion for their show, critical (anti-)fandom is fuelled by frustration or disappointment. The non-fans, because of their lack of intense involvement, aren't as emotionally effected by the show. This chapter has described these different discourses on fandom, showing that the academically coined concepts seem fairly separated from each other. This thesis shows that, within Wieisdemol.com, a combination of these negative and positive fan practices can be recognized. The discussed theoretical conceptions of fandom help to understand Wieisdemol.com, which in its turn, helps to reflect on these concepts.

---

[34] Gray, "New Audiences, New Textualities," 71.
[35] Idem 70 – 74.
[36] Sarah Harman and Bethan Jones. "Fifty Shades of Ghey : Snark Fandom and the Figure of the Anti-Fan," *Sexualities* 16, no. 8 (2013): 961.
[37] Ibidem.

Chapter 2: Method

This chapter serves as explanation and justification of the chosen corpus and methodology for this thesis. Wiesdemol.com has been a fan community for a long time, but fans start expressing themselves more and more negatively, addressing their discontent with the show. This chapter builds on the concept of discourse (analysis) by Foucault, Laclau and Mouffe to argue that the users' forum posts serve as linguistic utterances constituting a specific discourse on fandom – a discourse which combines concepts of different academic forms of fandom, thereby blurring the lines between these academic categories.

Corpus

Wieisdemol.com has been a popular place for WIDM fans to meet and discuss their beloved TV show. Wieisdemol.com consists of different boards for each season of WIDM, and each boards consists of discussion threads. The discussion threads are specified to one topic, for example, a specific contestant, challenge or theory. Within this thesis, only the board of the most recent season of WIDM is taken into account, as this is the board with the most recent activity. The board consists of 114 different discussion threads, making up for 16,194 posts in total.[38] To determine what practices there are, the first post(s) of each discussion thread was analysed, thereby placing the threads into different categories. The research also analyses the discussion thread '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*', which consists of a total of 354 posts.[39] As the purpose of this discussion thread is to evaluate the show – and as there is a lot of negativity within this thread – the discussion thread serves as a relevant corpus for it is contrary to the mainly positive fan practices on the rest of the forum, allowing for research into the relation between different academic fan discourses.

Discourse Analysis

The selected corpus described above has been analysed to see what discourse Wieisdemol.com constitutes. This section on discourse analysis serves as explanation of what a discourse means, by elaborately addressing Foucault's, Laclau's and Mouffe's perspective on this concept and why there's chosen for this specific method.

---

[38] This number was measured at 3 – 6 – 2017, 11:00 AM. It is possible for users to still post on this board. This means that the amount of posts and threads can still grow.
[39] Translated as: 'Critical commentary on this season'.

In short, according to scholars Marianne Jørgenson and Louise Philips, the concept of discourse has been widely used, but often in too vague or too specific ways. They offer a preliminary definition of a discourse: "a particular way of talking about and understanding the world (or an aspect of the world)."[40] A discourse analysis thus analyses how linguistic utterances shape different domains of social life.[41] A discourse, however, is not purely linguistic as John Hartley notes:

> The general theoretical notion is that while meaning can be generated only from the langue or rule-system of language, and while we can apprehend the world only through language systems, the fact remains that the recourses of language-in-general are and always have been subjected to the historical developments and conflicts of social relations. (…) Discourses are the product of social, historical and institutional formations, and meanings are produced by these institutionalised discourses.[42]

Hartley describes here that even though the world is understood and shaped through language, discourses themselves are influenced by developments in the 'real' world.[43] Hartley, Jørgenson, and Philips build on one of the main theorists on discourses, Michel Foucault. Stuart Hall has summarized Foucault's works on discourse. He states that Foucault gave the concept of discourse a new meaning:

> a group of statements which provide a language for talking about – a way of representing the knowledge about – a particular topic at a particular historical moment… Discourse is about the production of knowledge through language.[44]

Hall notes that Foucault not only meant linguistic utterances, but also practices one performs.[45] He states that Foucault argues that things outside the discourse – thing outside the system of representation – do not have a meaning. Discourse then is about understanding the world and seeing where meanings come from, and not about the material existence of objects.[46] As an example, Hall addresses Foucault's study of homosexuality. Throughout history, 'homosexual' relations and practices have always been there, but the concept of 'homosexuality' was produced through "moral, legal, medical and psychiatric discourses, practices and institutional apparatuses of the late nineteenth century."[47] Thus, the practices of what now is understood

---

[40] Marianne Jørgensen, and Louise Phillips, *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method* (London: SAGE Publications, 2002), 1.
[41] Ibidem.
[42] John Hartley, *Communication, Cultural and Media Studies: The Key Concepts* (New York, NY: Routledge, 2011), 100.
[43] Ibidem.
[44] Stuart Hall, "Foucault: Power, Knowledge and Discourse," in *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*, edited by Margaret Whetherell, Stephanie Taylor, and Simeon J. Yates (London: SAGE, 2001), 72.
[45] Ibidem.
[46] Idem, 73.
[47] Idem, 74.

as homosexuality were there, but the meaning and concept of it were produced through different discourses within different fields.

Hall notes that Foucault, in later works, focuses on the relation between power and knowledge. When knowledge (or, a particular discourse) is used to regulate and control others (for example to discriminate against homosexuality), it constitutes power relations. Hall addresses Foucault's concept of a 'regime of truth': when a certain knowledge is in power (discourse), it allows for a certain understanding of the world and other views are singled out.[48] However, on the level of 'micro-physics', power can be productive: power – and thus discourses – constitute different classification of individuals, provide for different 'legitimate' behaviour or allow different rituals to exist, all producing power within individuals or practices.[49] Power is not from top to bottom, but works more or less as a network.[50]

Foucault is one of the key authors on the concept of discourse. Laclau and Mouffe build further on his ideas and develop the so called 'discourse theory'. According to Jørgenson and Philips, Laclau and Mouffe argue that the meaning of phenomena can never be fixed.[51] Discourses struggle and the aim within their discourse theory is to:

> map out the processes in which we struggle about the way in which the meaning of signs is to be fixed, and the process by which some fixations of meaning become so conventionalised that we think of them as natural.[52]

Jørgenson and Philips take Laclau and Mouffe's concepts of moments, elements, discourse and articulation to explain how discourses struggle and how they can be analysed. They note that discourse is seen within this theory as a "fixation of meaning within a particular domain."[53] All signs within a discourse are moments.[54] However, a sign can have different meanings, therefore a discourse is mostly about reducing the possibilities of signs – or in other words, understanding an aspect of the world through a specific lens. Elements are "the signs whose meanings have not yet been fixed; signs that have multiple, potential meanings".[55] Within a discourse, elements are articulated as moments – articulation thus is the practice that establishes a relation between elements causing the meaning to be fixed.[56] Jørgenson and Philips argue that this discourse theory sees discourse as temporarily fixed: all apparent moments are elements articulated in a specific way to show coherence.[57] Discourses exclude, leaving space for discursive struggle.

---

[48] Idem, 76 – 77.
[49] Idem, 78.
[50] Idem, 77.
[51] Jørgenson and Philips, *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*, 24.
[52] Idem, 25 – 26.
[53] Idem, 26.
[54] Ibidem.
[55] Idem, 26 – 27.
[56] Idem, 28.
[57] Idem, 29.

By building on Foucault's notion that nothing is meaningful outside of the discourse, this thesis legitimizes the analysis of different forms of fandom on Wieisdemol.com in relation to academic theories. Laclau's and Mouffe's approach on discourse theory is used, as this looked into the struggle between different concepts of fandom. The thesis argues how signs (moments and elements - in this case, fan practices and utterances within the forum posts) can combine or articulate different opposing academic discourses on fandom.

Within discourse analysis, there are other approaches as well. Norman Fairclough, for example, is one of the theorists who developed critical discourse analysis (CDA). CDA focuses on how discourses relate to other social elements, as power relations, ideologies, institutions and social identities.[58] Fairclough's CDA emphasizes how changes within the discourse are social changes and how these changes impact non-discoursal elements of life.[59] As CDA focusses on change and aspects outside the discourse, this approach was not suited for this thesis. This thesis examined how the current discourse by users of Wieisdemol.com conflicted with and combined different academic discourses on fandom. This thesis bases itself on linguistic and textual utterances, as forum posts and academic articles, and does not investigate non-textual material, as Fairclough's social elements.

The choice of applying discourse analysis building on Foucault, Laclau and Mouffe allows for an in-depth analyses of one specific place (Wieisdemol.com) and how it – in itself, without influence of other (social) factors – serves as a place where a state of being is constituted. One might argue that it is important to look at these other factors as well – and it definitely will allow for new insights on Wieisdemol.com – however the purpose of this thesis is not to understand Wieisdemol.com better. The purpose of this thesis is to argue that different apparent opposing academic discourses interact with each other; therefore only focussing on the discursive struggle is a logical choice.

Operationalization

The main research question of this thesis is: How does the fan discourse constituted by users on Wieisdemol.com show that opposing academic discourses of fandom interact?

As stated above, a discourse analysis has been done in this thesis. By building on Foucault's study of madness, punishment and sexuality, Hall has identified six elements to, concretely, study discourses:

---

[58] Norman Fairclough, "Critical Discourse Analysis," in *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, edited by James Paul Gee and Michael Handford (New York, NY: Routledge, 2012), 9.
[59] Norman Fairclough, "Critical Discourse Analysis, " *International Advances in Engineering and Technology* 7 (2012): 452.

1) statements [or, Laclau's and Mouffe's elements and moments] […] which give us certain kind of knowledge about these things;
2) the rules which prescribe certain ways of talking about these topics [or Laclau and Mouffe's articulation] and exclude other ways - which govern what is 'sayable' or 'thinkable' […];
3) 'subjects' who in some way personify the discourse – […] with the attributes we would expect the subjects to have, given the way knowledge about the topic was constructed at that time;
4) how this knowledge about the topic acquires authority, a sense of embodying the 'truth' about it; constituting the 'truth of the matter', at a historical moment;
5) the practices within institutions for dealing with the subjects […] whose conduct is being regulated and organized according to those ideas;
6) acknowledgement that a different discourse or *episteme* will arise at a later historical moment, supplanting the existing one, opening up a new *discursive formation* […] [60]

Within this thesis, the six elements and Laclau's and Mouffe's concepts have been included. The analysed forum posts (1 – the statements; elements and moments) posted by users of Wieisdemol.com (3 – the subjects) constitute a certain state of being. The academic discourses on fandom (5 – the institutionalized practices) allows for a certain way of looking at this state of being (2 – the rules; articulation), constituting its own 'regime of truth', a specific way of understanding fandom (4 – knowledge). However, as the analysis of the posts shows, different discourses interact, lines are blurred possibly leading to a new 'episteme' of fandom (6 – acknowledgement of a different discourse).

To answer the main question, three sub questions have been formulated and answered:

1. How do users of Wieisdemol.com express different forms of active fandom?
2. How do users of Wieisdemol.com perform critical forms of fandom?
3. How do users of Wieisdemol.com define different categories of fandom?

Within Attachment A, the three sub questions are stated, along with the focus points and corpus that were used in order to answer these questions. In short, in order to answer the first sub question, the first post(s) of each thread was/were analysed and categorized into a specific category, based on the purpose of the discussion thread. In order to answer the second and third sub question, the users' posts within the discussion thread '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen'* were analysed, based on what academically recognized fan practices could be identified. The first and the second sub question's answer are used to reflect on the academic concepts which helped to understand the fan community of WIDM. As the first question focusses on the positive and the second question on the negative fan theories, they both serve

---

[60] Hall, "Foucault: Power, Knowledge and Discourse," 73 – 74.

as equally important in the reflection of the discursive struggle on Wieisdemol.com's fandom. The importance of the third question can be found in that it answers how fans themselves see different forms of fandom – and their own position therein.

Reflection

There are different limitations to the chosen method and corpus. One of the first limitations of this thesis is its limited corpus. The analysed data is brought back to one board for the first question and one thread for the second and third question. This relatively small amount of data opened the possibility to do an in-depth analysis. Due to the scope and topic of this research, an in-depth analysis of one critical thread was enough to make a comparative analysis of different fan practices. However, there are a lot more places where fans of WIDM meet online: other Internet forums, Facebook pages, Twitter, YouTube and other social media serve as other means to consume the show, all allowing for other fan practices and discourses.

Secondly, the discourse analysis has its own benefits and limitations. As already noted within the section 'Discourse Analysis', by using the concepts and theories developed by Foucault, Laclau and Mouffe, the focus on discourses is legitimized: the meaning of things only come about within the discourse.[61] As the goal of this thesis to argue that different discourses can be used to understand each other better, it is not needed, within the scope of this research, to take other social elements into account.

As this thesis examines a TV audience, a survey would have been another option to collect the data. However, surveys ask direct questions. This thesis benefits from the fact that the users of Wieisdemol.com posted without knowing that their posts might be used for research. As the thesis examines how the fandom creates a discourse, the interruption by a survey might have blurred the results. That questions that I as researcher would have asked or the answer the users might have given, might have been too biased, as we would both have had expectations. The interpretative analysis of the posts left more room for unexpected discoveries and connections between different fan practices.

Another point which should be reflected upon is my own position as a researcher, as I have been an active member on Wieisdemol.com for many years. Jenkins notes that:

> writing as a fan about fan culture poses certain potential risks for the academic critic, yet is also facilitates certain understandings and forms of access impossible through other positioning.[62]

---

[61] Idem, 73.
[62] Jenkins, *Textual Poachers*, 6.

Me being an insider on Wieisdemol.com opens up for risks: I might be too biased to objectively conduct a research. However, it also creates opportunities: I know the forum's history and how daily proceedings go. The knowledge I have can be used to give extra insights. It is however, as I did in this paragraph, important to make your position as research transparent, to show from what point-of-view the research was conducted.

Another issue with me being an aca-fan, is that I know forum members in real life. Therefore the users explicitly quoted within this research have been anonymized. The users, even though they posted their opinions and ideas in a publicly accessible place, didn't give explicit permission to be used within an academic context. Quotations are anonymized, emphasizing that it is my interpretation as researcher of those specific quotes, instead of the user's intention. However, for transparency, the links to the webpage on which the original posts can be found are provided with each quote, as those are accessible for everyone with an Internet connection.

Chapter 3: Analysis of Wieisdemol.com

This chapter argues that the positive fan practices of Wieisdemol.com (creating of fan art, making up fan theories, speculating about the show's progress) go hand-in-hand with the apparent contradiction of anti-fan practices. Through an analysis of the purpose of each discussion thread and the in-depth analysis of one of them it becomes clear that the academic discourses on fandom are not rigid categories, but interact with each other on Wieisdemol.com. The first section of this chapter identifies positive fan practices, while the second section examines the negative practices. The third section argues that (critical) fans make distinction between forum users and non-users and that their discontent is caused by a believe that the show is addressing these non-users more and more.

How do users of Wieisdemol.com express different forms of active fandom?

Wieisdemol.com has been closely tied to WIDM for many years. It has always been a place where users discuss and evaluate their favourite show. By looking to the first post(s) of each discussion thread on the WIDM 2017 board, it is argued that the discussion threads can be divided into four main categories: 1) theory and speculation, 2) the creation and organisation of fan content and activities, 3) the discussion of official WIDM content and 4) the evaluation of (aspects of) WIDM. This section points out the different positive fan practices, where the next sections look into oppositional, negative fan practices.

Within Wieisdemol.com, most of the discussion threads have been placed within the category of theory and speculation. Henry Jenkins identified the formulation of plot theories and the search for intertextual relations, as some of the reading practices of online fans of TWIN PEAKS.[63] Jason Mittell argued that discussion and theorization on the plot of LOST were some of the main activities of online fans of *Lostpedia*.[64] Within this research, discussion threads dedicated to discussing contestants, challenges, episodes, specific theories and spoilers were categorized together in the category of theory and speculation. In total, 69 out of 114 discussion threads have been placed within this category, making up for 9,120 out of 16,194 forum posts.[65]

---

[63] Jenkins, "Do You Enjoy Making the Rest of Us Feel Stupid, 119.
[64] Mittell, "Sites of Participation," paragraph 2.12.
[65] See Attachment B, Table 1; It should be noted that the posts were not analysed individually. This means that the total of posts within one category should be regarded with caution, as posts within discussion threads can derive from the thread's purpose. The numbers are an accumulation of all the posts of all the threads within a category and only show the activity of these threads.

This collective discussion of the questions the show poses, can be described with Jenkins' notion of collective intelligence. Jenkins, by building on Pierre Lévy's work, describes the fan forum of SURVIVOR as a 'collective intelligence':

> Collective intelligence refers to this ability of virtual communities to leverage the combined expertise of their members. What we cannot know or do on our own, we may now be able to do collectively.[66]

Within the discussion threads, users react to each other's insights and opinions, predict outcomes of the show or discuss theories on the possible identity of the Mole. Just as Jenkins notes, the users use the expertise of different members to combine their knowledge and predict the possible behaviour of the Mole. An example of this, is the thread '*Molpunten 2017 – uitslag bekend.*'[67] Within this thread, one user (for the sake of privacy called Poll Master) opens a voting poll where others can vote on certain behaviours or choices by the production which they think are suspicious:

> As usual, after each episode you can decide [through votes] which actions are suspicious or not. When an action gets a lot of votes, the contestant who did this action, gets Mole-points. When an action is unsuspicious, this contestants loses Mole-points. The assumption of this theory is that the Mole acts suspicious and so gathers a lot of Mole-points. Contestants with a lot of Mole-points are therefore suspicious.[68]

The options in the voting poll are influenced - and proposed - by other users. Poll Master then analyses the outcomes of the voting poll and visualises these, leading to statistics on who might (not) be the Mole. In 2017, the eventual Mole was primary suspect within these statistics after only four of the ten episodes. This discussion thread is an example of a collective intelligence practice where users collectively figure out the Mole, while relying on the expertise and analytic skills of Poll Master.

The second biggest category of discussion threads is fan content: fan or fan forum initiated content, activities or overviews. Both Mittell, in his discussion of *Lostpedia*, and Costello and Moore recognize the production and consumption of fan content as an important fan practice.[69] On Wieisdemol.com, different threads are dedicated to activities that can be placed within this category: writing of new challenges, fan art, a forum organized chat with the host of WIDM, and betting pools, making up for 14 out of the 114 discussion, with a total of 2,373 out of 16,194 posts.[70] Andrejevic explains that this practice is done, because these

---

[66] Jenkins, "Spoiling Survivor," 27.
[67] Wieisdemol.com, '*Molpunten 2017 – uitslag bekend*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum/ index.php?topic=60043.0; Translation of the thread title is "Mole-point 2017 – results known."
[68] See Attachment C, Quote 2. '*Molpunten 2017 – uitslag bekend*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum /index.php?topic=60043.0.
[69] Mittell, "Sites of Participation," paragraph 2.21; Costello and Moore, "Cultural Outlaws," 136.
[70] See Attachment B, Table 2.

online viewers want to make a TV show more entertaining.[71] Or, as one of the users posts in reaction to a "vriendlief" (a caricature drawing by the user of the same name):

Yay! Vriendlief! This is always is one of the Mole's highlights! [72]

The third biggest category recognized is discussion threads on official WIDM canon. Mittell argues for canon as one of the biggest types of content on *Lostpedia,* and Costello and Moore see the collecting and maintaining of program information and other media content as an fan activity.[73] On Wieisdemol.com, different discussion threads serve as place where official WIDM canon is discussed. There are threads on MOLTALK (the WIDM talk show broadcast after the regular episodes), the twitter account of 'the Mole', diaries by contestants and the WIDM fan day. This category exists of 10 out of the 114 discussion threads, making up for 1,458 out of the 16,194 pots.[74] It should be noted that some of these discussion threads on WIDM canon serve as new possible research material in uncovering the identity of the Mole and could therefore be categorized within theory and speculation as well.

The fourth category recognized is 'evaluation'. Andrejevic and Costello and Moore both recognize fans that provide feedback. Costello and Moore claim that fans want to influence their show, Andrejevic notes that the viewers within his research know that their influence is just an illusion.[75] Within Wieisdemol.com, users discuss, evaluate and speculate on former, current or upcoming seasons and aspects of WIDM as well, making up for the fourth largest category and consists of 9 out of the 114 discussion threads, making up for 844 out of the 16,194 posts.[76] Where the former three categories were focused on positive fan practices, this category includes negative forms of fandom as well. The biggest thread within this category is '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen'* which opens with a 2000 word analysis of what is right, but mostly what is wrong, with WIDM.[77]

Within the analysis, there were two more categories: a category of general information, with non-specific discussion threads not focussed on one particular topic; and a category of threads on Wieisdemol.com site information as, for example, behavioural rules. Three threads were not categorized, as they didn't belong in one of the categories: one thread was about hypothetical WIDM DVDs, one thread asked if there was a mathematician within the fan

---

[71] Andrejevic, "Watching Television Without Pity," 32.
[72] See Attachment C, Quote 3. '*Vriendliefjes !*', http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum/index.php?topic=60306.20.
[73] Costello and Moore, "Cultural Outlaws," 136; Mittell, "Sites of Participation", paragraph 2.11.
[74] See Attachment B, Table 3.
[75] Andrejevic, "Watching Television Without Pity, 33; Costello and Moore, "Cultural Outlaws," 137.
[76] Attachment B, Table 4.
[77] Translated as 'Critical commentary on the current season'; '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen'*, http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum/index.php?topic=60039.0.

community and one thread asked if there was any behind the scene footage, which there was not.[78]

As this categorization has shown, Wieisdemol.com fits the idea of a fan community theorizing on the show's development, creating and organizing fan content and activities, and maintaining almost all of the official WIDM content produced. Wieisdemol.com is a collective intelligence, which not only discusses, but also actively create content to expand their enjoyment of the show.

How do user of Wieisdemol.com perform critical forms of fandom?

Fan evaluation and criticism has been a big part of the WIDM 2017 board, as a part of the fan community was not pleased with the quality of the season. The users gave feedback, comparing WIDM 2017 with an idealized version of the show. By using academic articles and theories on fan criticism and anti-fandom, this section shows how the apparent contradiction between being a fan and being critical go hand in hand. Critical fans are fans, because they do care a lot. For the in-depth analysis of critical fandom, this section uses the discussion thread '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*' as case study as this was the most popular discussion thread in the category of evaluation (see section 1).

The discussion thread '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*' opens with a 2000 words analysis. The user expresses his opinion on the quality of the show's contestants, challenges, filming location and editing.[79] This user, and others as well, mostly formulate their concerns and discontent as feedback. As one user posted:

> I would argue for more complex/ambitious challenges and show these better, for more neutral editing and for more screen time of the group's process. Let the host and the contestants dine together and show one minute of that footage in the episode.[80]

Other examples of this formulation of feedback are one of the users suggesting that the producers should choose to never eliminate a contestant in the first episode or a user commenting on specific challenges and proposing how they could be improved.[81,] Fans take the position of critics. Henry Jenkins elaborated on fan criticism, stating that organized fandom

---

[78]See Attachment B, Table 5, Table 6 and Table 7.
[79] '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum/index.php?topic=60039.0.
[80] See Attachment C, Quote 4; '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum /index.php?topic=60039.80.
[81] '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum/index.php?topic=60039.60.

is "first and foremost, an institution of theory and criticism." [82] Wieisdemol.com is such a space, where fans interpret, discuss and evaluate their show.

One of the ways fan express their critique according to Jenkins, is through evaluating and comparing contemporary episodes to idealized version of the show.[83] This idealized version is what Jenkins describes as the 'meta-text': an idealized conception of a TV show, created through careful analysis of earlier episodes and through (unconsciously) constructing an imaginary perfect version.[84] This dynamic also happens on Wieisdemol.com:

> I don't know if 'the past is always better', but I do know that I miss the thrill within the challenges: a weird psychological twist which did exist in earlier seasons in my opinion.[85]

As seen in this quote, the user refers to an idea of what WIDM is supposed to be. The user bases this on earlier version of the show. This is in accordance with Goodman's theory on disappointed fans. Goodman notes that the first text of a series (for example *The Philosopher's Stone* in the *Harry Potter* series) creates a fictional world. Texts which build upon this first text, as prequels and sequels, expand and (possibly) contradict the constituted universe.[86] When fans feel that these later texts damage the fictional universe, fans feel disappointed and start to disregard the authority of the author.[87] Goodman's ideas on fictional universes, are resembling the discontent within the users of Wieisdemol.com. These users are disappointed in the fact that the recent seasons of WIDM do not share the aesthetic, narrative and emotional characteristics of the early WIDM seasons.

> I'm still a fan of the format, but the Dutch WIDM really lost focus on the essence of the show. Beautiful filming locations is completely fine, and I do like that, but it has to go hand in hand with interesting challenges.[88]

Goodman describes this process of feedback as 'fix-it fics': fan fiction that rewrites original source texts to prevent apparent mistakes in the source text (like the death of a character).[89] Even though Wieisdemol.com and the users do not express themselves through fan fiction, they do create a better imaginary version of WIDM through the detailed analysis of the show. Through the writing of feedback, users fix the show so that it fits their meta-textual concept of it.

---

82 Jenkins, *Textual Poachers,* 88.
83 Idem, 100.
84 Idem, 101.
85 See Attachment C, Quote 5; '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen,*' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum /index.php?topic=60039.300.
86 Goodman, "Disappointing Fans," 4 – 5.
87 Idem, 7 -8.
88 See Attachment C, Quote 6; '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen,*' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum /index.php?topic=60039.300.
89 Goodman, "Disappointing Fans," 3.

With the help of Gray's conception of the anti-fan and its relation with paratextual material, it becomes clear that earlier or other international variants of WIDM are crucial to the conceptualization of WIDM as meta-text. According to Gray, anti-fans are "those who strongly dislike a given text or genre, considering it inane, stupid, morally bankrupt and/or aesthetic drivel."[90] Despite what is often assumed, Gray claims that anti-fans have a profound base for their dislike:

> In this or any other case, clearly anti-fans construct an image of the text – and, what is more, an image they feel is accurate – sufficiently enough that they can react to and against it.[91]

Gray notes that this dislike is highly influenced by paratexts. He draws on Genette's conceptualization of 'paratext': a text that provides a way for a reader to make sense of the original text.[92] Genette says that the "text in itself is incapable of adapting to changes", while the paratext is "more flexible, more versatile, always transitory."[93] Paratexts circulate and therefor influences the meaning of the original text, for example reviews or interviews.[94] Gray states that the anti-fan's ability to give a grounded argument for their dislike of the show, is a result from the consumption of these paratexts.[95]

When regarding earlier and international variants of WIDM as paratext, the discontent with the users is explained. A lot of the user's feedback is based on the idea that earlier seasons, and the praised Belgian revival of the show, are of a better standard.

> It's says all there it to say when the Belgian Wie is de Mol was a real relief last year. [96]

> And the Belgians do that [showing interesting group dynamic] better than 'we' do in my opinion.[97]

Because of their knowledge of WIDM's history and international varieties, the critical users create a meta-text of WIDM, where the best elements of all versions are incorporated. Their expectations are not met and fans get disappointed. Again, there is a resemblance with anti-fandom. Gray notes that anti-fans are aware of:

---

[90] Gray, "New Audiences, New Textualities," 70.
[91] Idem, 71.
[92] Gérard Genette, "Conclusion," in *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, edited by Richard Macksey and Michael Sprinker (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 408.
[93] Ibidem.
[94] Gray, "New Audiences, New Textualities," 72.
[95] Idem, 73.
[96] See Attachment C, Quote 7; '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum /index.php?topic=60039.80.
[97] Seee Attachment B, Quote 8; '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum /index.php?topic=60039.180.

what a text should be like, […] what is a waste of media time and space, [...] what morality or aesthetics texts should adopt, and what we would like to see others watch or read.[98]

The WIDM critics are resembling anti-fandom; however they intensively watch (or have watched) the show, instead of reading it from the outskirts.[99]

Even though the users of Wieisdemol.com are not anti-fans in Gray's understanding, as they do watch (or have watched) the show intensively, the concept of anti-fandom can be used to understand the practices of the fan community. A part of Wieisdemol.com's users express themselves critically, basing themselves on paratextual material as international varieties and earlier seasons of the show. Through the extensive feedback, users do not just complain, but give elaborate argumentation why the show is not what they want it to be.

How do users of Wieisdemol.com define different categories of fandom?

By looking again at the thread called *'Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen'*, this section argues that the users of Wieisdemol.com make a clear distinction between the 'non-fans' and their online community. By addressing Bourdieu, Harman and Jones, it is argued that a part of the forum users see the viewers at home as a mass whose main interest in the show comes from entertainment, while they themselves are attracted to the show's complexity. These forum users also believe that their discontent comes from the production's attempt to address this mass audience. This section concludes by arguing that fans themselves do not make a distinction between fandom and anti-fandom. It shows that the anti-fan practices and fan criticism in the second section is pushed by the same motivation as the positive fan practices in the first section, namely love for the show.

The critical users on Wieisdemol.com draw a line between themselves (the online forum fans) and the viewers at home. The concept of 'viewers at home' resembles Gray's notion of non-fans: "those viewers or readers who do view or read a text, but not with any intense involvement".[100] These non-fans are a majority and experience the text often in a non-intensive, non-resisting way.[101] Wieisdemol.com users separate themselves from non-fans:

What I ask myself: how does an 'average' WIDM fan watch season 16? [102]

---

[98] Gray, "New Audiences, New Textualities, 73.
[99] Idem, 71.
[100] Idem, 74.
[101] Idem, 75 – 76.
[102] See Attachment C, Quote 9; '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum

Episode 5 was for me more of an episode for the 'average' viewer [103]

I assume that "normal" people watch [WIDM] in a different way than the "forum users" [104]

The above mentioned quotes, where words as 'average' and 'normal are put within quotation marks, show that the users see themselves as different from the non-fans. Harman and Jones claim that anti-fans share a certain taste, which is claimed to be better or higher than the taste of others.[105] Harman and Jones conclude their analysis of anti-fandom within the *Fifty Shades of Grey*-trilogy as follows:

The interpretive, communal nature of anti-fans and anti-fan communities thus plays an important role in not only enforcing taste, but in negotiating the meaning found in *Fifty Shades*.[106]

These anti-fans not only want to express their high level of taste, but also want to 'warn' others of the potential morally wrong meaning of the text.[107] A part of the critical users, when referring to non-forum users, enforce taste: they regard themselves as different, almost superior to those others, suggesting that their dislike is a result of the low quality of WIDM. Wieisdemol.com users constitute a difference between the intellectual online fans, who love complexity and mind puzzles, and the mass audience of non-fans, who would only enjoy simple entertainment.

With an audience of millions of people, you cannot expect that everyone gets or likes twists and deeper meaning, but a few more challenges could very well be complex or have this deeper meaning.[108]

Everyone must get what they want: the WIDM fans (or, stated boldly, the people here on this forum) and the 'normal' viewer. This are two completely different categories with completely different interests. [109]

I have the impression that the producer, now Wie is de Mol has gotten very popular, don't want to make the show too complex.[110]

/index.php?topic=60039.40.

[103] See Attachment C, Quote 10; '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum /index.php?topic=60039.180.

[104]See Attachment C, Quote 11; '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum /index.php?topic=60039.140.

[105] Harman and Jones, "Fifty Shades of Ghey," 961.

[106] Idem, 963.

[107] Idem, 963.

[108] See Attachment C, Quote 12; '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum /index.php?topic=60039.300.

[109] See Attachment C, Quote 13; '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum /index.php?topic=60039.120.

[110] See Attachment C, Quote 14; '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum /index.php?topic=60039.320.

The superior position the fan critics take to those non-fans is influenced believe that the producers have changed the show for the worse to address these non-fans. This position of superiority is addressed by Harman and Jones, when they build on Bourdieu's notion of cultural capital: taste and one's position in society (based on education, wealth, etc.) are linked.[111] According to Fiske, fans produce their own 'products' or texts and therefore create their own cultural capital. This creates a divide between people who are in possession (of the means and knowledge to 'understand' WIDM) and the people who are not.[112] The critical users create their own understanding of WIDM and those who do not understand it in that specific way, are deemed inferior.

The critical fans are disappointed that the show has, according to them, started to address the non-fans more and more. The negative fan practices discussed in section two are therefore a means to improve the show and thus come from love for the programme. The fan critics discuss this as well:

> The <u>critique</u> on the show is fuelled by the <u>love</u> for the show.[113]

> I think that most of the critical users said it, but the critique is not to insult the show, but as a means to improve it. They miss something and that is what this forum comes into play.[114]

The analysed fans draw a distinction between themselves and the viewers at home and mostly the fans talk in a superior way about the others. They explain their dislike for the show through the fact that, according to them, the show addresses the mass viewers more and more. They are disappointed in the producers for making the show easier. Their critical position towards the show is not because of hate, but because they care about their favourite TV show and the users are disappointed they see the quality of it degrading.

How does the fan discourse constituted by users on Wieisdemol.com show that opposing academic discourses of fandom interact?

This chapter has argued that four main categories of fan practices can be recognized on Wieisdemol.com: theory and discussion, the production and consumption of fan content, the maintaining of official WIDM canon and the evaluation of the show. The first three categories have been shown as mainly positive, where fans extend their pleasure of the show through creating extra content and organizing extra activities. The fourth category, evaluation has been

---

[111] Fiske, "The Cultural Economy of Fandom," 31 – 32.
[112] Idem, 31 - 33.
[113] See Attachment C, Quote 15; '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com /forum/index.php?topic=60039.200.
[114] See Attachment C, Quote 16; '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com /forum/index.php?topic=60039.200.

mainly negative: fans provide feedback and express their disappointment in WIDM. Through the comparison with earlier and international versions of the show, the fans construct an ideal (imaginary) version of WIDM, an expectation not met by the 17th season of the programme. Within the analysed thread, fans made a distinction between them and the regular viewers, claiming that the producers focus more and more on the mass audience, resulting in an allegedly degraded quality of the show.

This analysis of a fan community has shown that different academic concepts and discourses on the positive and negative aspects fandom are not that distinct and that they can be used to help understand each other. This chapter points out that for example discourse of anti-fandom (based on both Gray's and Harman and Jones' conceptions) can be used to understand Jenkins' fan criticism and the provision of feedback, recognized by both Andrejevic and Costello and Moore. This chapter also shows that the anti-fan practices performed are not performed by anti-fans in Gray's sense, but by active fans who care and love the show enough to express their disappointment elaborately. Besides the discussion, the creation of fan content and the maintenance of canon, the critical anti-fan practices are an important part of active fandom. Both forms of practices have the same source, which is out of love for the show, and the same goal, which is to gain extra enjoyment from WIDM. This thesis ultimately argues for more research into the dynamics between these positive and negative fan practices – within one specific part of the audience - as these practices are not separated, but intertwined, as shown in this research.

Conclusion

Through the analysis of forum posts, this thesis argues that Wieisdemol's fan practices can mainly be divided into four categories: theory and speculation, production and consumption of fan content, maintaining of WIDM canon and the evaluation of the show's quality. The category of evaluation is the odd one out: the first three categories are practices in which fans of the shows prolong their pleasure, while the fourth category is a practice in which fans critically express themselves. Wieisdemol.com's combination of these categories shows that different academic concepts on fan behaviour are too narrow and are unable to include the complexity of fan communities. This thesis shows that concepts and theories on fandom are useful, but it argues that they should be used to help understand each other. The discursive struggle between different notions of fandom is a productive struggle, as this thesis demonstrates that new insights can be gained when these struggling concepts are used to help understand each other.

This thesis asks question about the way viewers and fans consume texts. It blurs the boundaries between those who dislike a text and critical fans, as both perform comparable reading strategies. It also undermines the dichotomy between active fans and passive viewers, as it shows that this distinction is mostly constituted by the fans themselves. The academic implications of this thesis, is that it not only asks questions about the nature of audience for television, but the arguments used here can be applied to other fields as well. Within literature, film studies, game studies or theatre studies, fandom and the consumption of media texts are important topics of research as well. When researching the negative and positive fan or reader practices of those media, the complex nature of audiences can be further reflected upon.

Discussion

One of the main characteristics of this research which should be reflected upon, is the chosen method of discourse analysis through the analysis of forum posts. The analysed forum posts were posted by the users without them knowing it was going to be used for research. This led to a somewhat 'unfocused' corpus, especially in the topic '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen'* where sometimes the forum posts weren't centred around giving feedback, as, for example, some users posted personal attacks or compliments. A survey might have solved the issue of unfocused data, however a survey brings its own limitations, for it often directs the research in certain directions because of bias in the questions or answers. The analysis of forum posts allowed the researcher to define and argue what practices could be recognized, based on data produced by WIDM fans without the interference of a research survey.

Another point of reflection is the limited corpus, as only one discussion thread was analysed in-depth and only one fan community served as research corpus. However, within the scope of this research, and the thesis' goal in mind, the selected data was enough to provide for grounded foundation for this thesis' final argument.

For further research, a focus on other media could be a productive and useful addition. Within the age of multiple social media, an Internet forum is just one of the many possibilities in which viewers of the show can make sense of WIDM. Other media invite for other use, leading to different (fan) practices and different ways in which concepts on fandom can be combined. Instead of analysing other media, new research might dive into the same phenomena on different geographical locations, seeing how other cultures consume media and perform fan practices. Another insight can be gained from using concepts of active fan behaviour to understand non- and anti-fandom better. This thesis used theories of non- and anti-fandom to reflect on an active fan community, but turning this around will give new insights in the academic concepts and relations between them.

This thesis has positioned itself between different academic notions of fandom and has shown that different concepts of anti-fandom and critical fandom can be used to help understand the concepts of fandom and fan communities better. As most research has focused on one of the concepts or 'sides' of fandom, this research placed itself in the middle of the debate. It thus argues for a stronger connection and more research into the dynamics between active and critical fandom, as these practices seem quite separated and are often discussed apart from each other. However, they are both part of the same process: fans deeply caring about their favourite media text – and research should therefore focus more and how those practices can be combined.

Bibliography

Andrejevic, Mark. "Watching Television Without Pity: The Productivity of Online Fans." *Television & New Media* 9, no. 1 (2008): 24–46.

Bird, Elizabeth S. "Are We All Produsers Now? Convergence and Media Audience Practices." *Cultural Studies* 25, no. 4–5 (2011): 502–517.

Costello, Victor, and Barbara Moore. "Cultural Outlaws: An Examination of Audience Activity and Online Television Fandom." *Television & New Media* 8, no. 2 (2007): 124–143.

Fairclough, Norman. "Critical Discourse Analysis." In *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, edited by James Paul Gee and Michael Handford, 9–20. New York, NY: Routledge, 2012.

Fairclough, Norman. "Critical Discourse Analysis." *International Advances in Engineering and Technology* 7 (2012): 452–487.

Fiske, John. "The Cultural Economy of Fandom." In *The Adoring Audience: Fan Culture and Popular Media*, edited by Lisa A. Lewis, 30–49. New York, NY: Routledge, 1992.

Genette, Gérard. "Conclusion." In *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, edited by Richard Macksey and Michael Sprinker, 404–427. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Goodman, Lesley. "Disappointing Fans: Fandom, Fictional Theory, and the Death of the Author." *The Journal of Popular Culture* 48, no. 4 (2015): 662–676.

Gray, Jonathan. "New Audiences, New Textualities: Anti-Fans and Non-Fans." *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 6, no. 1 (2003): 64–81.

Hall, Stuart. "Foucault: Power, Knowledge and Discourse." In *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*, edited by Margaret Whetherell, Stephanie Taylor, and Simeon J. Yates, 72–81. London: SAGE, 2001.

Harman, Sarah, and Bethan Jones. "Fifty Shades of Ghey: Snark Fandom and the Figure of the Anti-Fan." *Sexualities* 16, no. 8 (2013): 951–968.

Hartley, John. *Communication, Cultural and Media Studies: The Key Concepts.* New York, NY: Routledge, 2011.

Jenkins, Henry. *Textual Poachers: Television Fans & Participatory Culture*. New York, NY: Routledge, 1992.

Jenkins, Henry. "Spoiling Survivor: The Anatomy of a Knowledge Community." In *Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide*, 25–58. New York: New York University Press, 2006.

Jenkins, Henry. "Do You Enjoy Making the Rest of Us Feel Stupid: Alt.tv.twinpeaks, the Trickster Author, and Viewer Mastery." In *Fans, Bloggers, and Gamers: Exploring Participatory Culture*, 115–134. New York, NY, 2006.

Jørgensen, Marianne, and Louise J Phillips. *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: SAGE Publications, 2002.

Mittell, Jason. "Sites of Participation: Wiki Fandom and the Case of Lostpedia." *Transformative Works and Cultures* 3 (2009).

Other Sources:

De Telegraaf. Film en Uitgaan. "Bijna drie miljoen kijkers Wie is de Mol." http://www.telegraaf.nl/filmenuitgaan/rtv/27783891 /__Bijna_drie_miljoen_kijkers_WIDM__.html.

Realitynet. "Startpagina." http://realitynet.org/index.php.

Realitynet. "Wie is de Mol AVROTROS 2017." http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum.

Stichting Kijk Onderzoek. TV Kijkcijfers. "Jaar Top 100 Exclusief Sport." https://kijkonderzoek.nl/component/com_kijkcijfers/Itemid,133/file,n1-1-1-p.

Wieisdemol.com. "Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen." http://www.wieisdemol.com /forum/index.php?topic=60039.0.

Wieisdemol.com. "Molpunten 2017 – uitslag bekend." http://www.wieisdemol.com
/forum/index.php?topic=60043.0.

Wieisdemol.com. "Vriendliefjes !." http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum
/index.php?topic=60306.0.

Attachment A: Analysis Scheme

This analysis scheme describes step-by-step how an answer to the research question and the sub question was formulated. The main question of this thesis was: How does the fan discourse constituted by users on Wieisdemol.com show that opposing academic discourses of fandom interact?

1. How do users of Wieisdemol.com express different forms of active fandom?
2. How do users of Wieisdemol.com perform critical forms of fandom?
3. How do users of Wieisdemol.com define different categories of fandom?

Sub question	Corpus	Focus points	Steps taken:
1	- Of all the 114 threads on the board of WIDM 2017, the first post(s) were analysed.	- Purpose of each discussion thread: theory, (discussion of) fan content, (discussion) official content, evaluation, general, other - Practices related to academic theories on fandom: Jenkins' collective intelligence, Costello and Moore's scale of fandom	- Reading of all the threads and defining its purpose - Comparing the threads and sort them into different categories (see Attachment B)
2	- The discussion thread '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*' was analyzed.[115]	- The arguments used to perform these critical forms of fandom: feedback, the construction of WIDM as meta-text, relating to other version and editions of WIDM - Practices related to academic theories on critical fandom: Jenkins' fan critics, Gray's, Harman and Jones' concept of anti-fandom, Goodman's theory on fix-it fiction.	- Reading all of the posts and marking different forms of fan critical practices: feedback, suggestions, relating to other versions of WIDM - Relating the identified practices with academic theory - Reading all of the posts again, now with the theories in mind and making new categorizations based on a combination of step 1 and step 2 (see Attachment B).

---

[115] '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum/index.php?topic=60039.0

| 3 | - The discussion thread *Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen* was analysed. [116] | - Expressions on the difference between the Wieisdemol.com fans and others.
- Practices related to academic theories on different forms of fandom: Gray's non-fans, Harman, Jones, Bourdieu and Fiske on taste and distinction. | - Reading all of the posts and marking different ways in which fans separate themselves from others
- Relating the identified practices with academic theory
- Reading all of the posts again, now with the theories in mind and looking for relations. |

---

[116] Ibidem.

Attachment B: Categorization of the Wieisdemol.com discussion threads

All of the discussion threads of Wieisdemol.com's board on WIDM 2017 were analysed through their first posts. Each first post (or posts, when it was not clear yet) was examined to determine what the purpose of each thread was. In these tables, one can see the names of the threads, their number of posts and a short description of the content or theme of the thread. This categorization was mainly used to answer the first sub question: How do users of Wieisdemol.com express different forms of active fandom?

Table 1: Discussion Threads on Theory and Speculation[117]

Discussion Thread Title	Posts	Content / Theme:
[MOL] Thomas Cammaert	1115	Contestant
Wie is de Mol ? - poll	608	Predictions
[KANDIDAAT] Jeroen Kijk in de Vegte	461	Contestant
[KANDIDAAT] Jochem van Gelder	366	Contestant
[KANDIDAAT] Diederik Jekel	321	Contestant
Wie verdenkt wie?	321	Specific Theory
Theorie: Tweelingen / dubbele dingen	290	Specific Theory
Wie wordt de afvaller?	264	Predictions
[KANDIDAAT] Imanuelle Grives	259	Contestant
[KANDIDAAT] Sanne Wallis de Vries	250	Contestant
Afleveringstitels	242	Specific Theory
[KANDIDAAT] Sigrid ten Napel	202	Contestant
Aflevering 4 - opdracht 3 - veeveiling	194	Challenge
Aflevering 3 - opdracht 1 - estafette in de duinen	182	Challenge
Aflevering 2 - 'meegaand'	177	Episode
Aflevering 2 - opdracht 3 - de rechtbank	173	Challenge
Waarom Thomas NIET de Mol is!	173	Contestant
Aflevering 2 - opdracht 1 - the papermill	168	Challenge
Afvallerstheorie?	160	Specific Theory
Wie is... de mol NIET? -poll	154	Predictions
Aflevering 2 - opdracht 2 - kermis	149	Challenge
Aflevering 3 - opdracht 3 - ritje door de stad	148	Challenge
Aflevering 6 - 'wijzer worden?'	143	Episode
Aflevering 10 - De finale	139	Episode
Aflevering 1 -' ... zo gedaan ... '	127	Episode
Aflevering 9 - Opdracht 2 - De verdubbelaar	117	Challenge
Aflevering 6 - opdracht 3 - op zoek bij de rodeo	114	Challenge
Aflevering 4 - "meer dan normaal"	108	Episode
Aflevering 5 - opdracht 2 - Rodeo posters	101	Challenge
Aflevering 7 - opdracht 1 - vragen oplossen in Lavapark	93	Challenge

---

[117] The number of posts within Table 1 – Table 7 was measured on 3 – 6 – 2017, at 13:00. As the forum is still open to posting, these numbers can still grow.

Aflevering 8 - 'raam taal'	89	Episode
Aflevering 5 - 'teugels in handen'	85	Episode
Aflevering 3 - "einde verhaal"	85	Episode
Aflevering 1 - opdracht 1 - Op zoek naar de eerste vrijstelling	72	Challenge
[KANDIDAAT] Roos Schlikker	72	Contestant
Aflevering 6 - opdracht 1 - Pendleton Underground	69	Challenge
Aanwijzingen in de leader	68	Specific Theory
De beste positie van de Mol	66	Best Mole Position
Aflevering 8 - opdracht 2 - antieke spreekwoorden	66	Challenge
Aflevering 4 - opdracht 1 - rodeo	64	Challenge
Spoilertopic	64	Predictions
Aflevering 1 - Test en executie	63	Challenge
Molpunten 2017 - uitslag bekend	63	Specific Method of Analysis
Aflevering 6 - opdracht 2 - grasmaaien	59	Challenge
Aflevering 9 - 'het einde in zicht'	57	Episode
Aflevering 5 - opdracht 1 - Oregon trail	54	Challenge
Aflevering 3 - opdracht 2 - kandidaten uitbeelden	51	Challenge
Aflevering 4 - opdracht 2 - hooibalen	49	Challenge
[KANDIDAAT] Yvonne Coldeweijer	49	Contestant
Mol geld (handtekening en letters)	46	Specific Theory
Aflevering 8 - opdracht 1 - fietsen door Painted Hills	45	Challenge
Aflevering 9 - Opdracht 1 - Moltown	43	Challenge
[THEORIE] Sigrid's Terugkeer	43	Contestant
Aflevering 8 - opdracht 3 - ongezien door Fort Rock	39	Challenge
Aflevering 1 - opdracht 2 - theateropdracht	39	Challenge
Niet kloppende (terugkerende) theorieën ieder jaar.	37	Theories in general
[KANDIDAAT] Vincent Vianen	34	Contestant
Aflevering 7 - opdracht 2 - luchtballonnen en een cabrio	33	Challenge
Aflevering 7 - 'verblinden'	31	Episode
[Theorie] Follow the Money	29	Specific Theory
Wie is de winnaar? Poll	26	Predictions
Wie is de verliezer ? (poll)	24	Predictions
Voorspel de potstand aan het eind van de serie!	23	Predictions
Aflevering 7 - opdracht 3 - schieten te paard	22	Challenge
Cijfers liegen niet. Statistieken 2010-2017	15	Specific Theory
[THEORIE] Opdrachten lopen in elkaar over, mol gedrag ook	9	Specific Theory
Positie van de mol in de leaders	7	Specific Theories
Verdeel en heers Tactiek	6	Specific Theory
Gezichten in afbeelding widm app	5	Specific Theory
Total:	9120	

Table 2: Discussion Threads on fan or forum initiated content, overviews or activities

Discussion Thread Title	Posts	Content / Theme:
Funstuff - Het onderschriftenspel	1078	Fun stuff
Wie Is De Mol? in de media	440	Overview
Wie is........ De Mol? POOL	247	WIDM Pool
Chat met Art / Vragenvuur (dinsdag 28 februari)	136	Chat with the shows host

Vriendliefjes !	135	Fan Art
WIDM Stemwijzer 2017	91	Quiz
Wie is de Mol? 2017 Locaties	65	Overiew
Geillustreerde samenvattingen	56	Fan Art
Bedenk zelf een opdracht voor seizoen 18!	51	Create your own challenge
Wie is de Mol? All Stars Edition	50	Fans as Casting Directors
Molbeurs 2017	18	WIDM Betting Pool
Gerelateerde sites/Zelf Wie Is De Mol organiseren	3	Related fan sites
Chat	2	Invitation to Chat
Columns widm 2017	1	Columns
Total:	**2373**	

Table 3: Discussion Threads on 'official' WIDM related content

Discussion Thread Title	Posts	Content / Theme:
Moltalk	374	WIDM Talkshow
Tweets van de Mol	322	WIDM Tweets
Dagboek Mol	293	Official Diary of the Mole
Wie Is De Mol Fandag 18 maart 2017	180	Molfandag
Wie is de Mol app	157	WIDM App
Dagboek van de afvaller	36	Diary eliminated contestants
Molboekje 2017	31	WIDM Info booklet
Wie is de Mol.nl forum	22	Thread on end official forum
[MFD] Veilingitems	22	Molfandag
Annemieke hier	21	WIDM item in radio show
Total:	**1458**	

Table 4: Discussion Threads on evaluating the quality of (aspects of) WIDM

Discussion Thread Title	Posts	Content / Theme:
Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen	354	Criticism
Grappige momenten	154	Funny Moments
Complimenten productie!	99	Compliments
Kijkcijfers 2017	87	Viewing Figures
Wie is de beste mol ooit?	42	Best Mole Ever
Wie is jouw favoriete kandidaat?	35	Favorite Contestant
Taartdiagram - of... wat mis je het meest op .com?	30	Evaluating the fan forum
Waarom Thomas een goede mol was.	26	Competence of the Mole
De beste opdracht ooit?	17	Beste Challenge Ever
Total	**844**	

Table 5: General, non-specific discussion threads

Discussion Thread Title	Posts	Content / Theme:
Wie is de Mol? 2017	1322	General
Het Wie Is De Mol Off Topic topic	369	General
Wie is de Mol? 2018	299	General Info
Downloads	85	Downloads
[PRESENTATOR] Art Rooijakkers	83	Show's Host
Total:	2158	

Table 6: Discussion Threads on information about the fan forum

Discussion Thread Title	Posts	Content / Theme:
Vragen over WieIsDeMol.Com	36	Questions
Enquête Wieisdemol.com	26	Inquiry to improve the site
Nieuw(s) op de site	21	News
Lees dit eerst, voordat je hier berichten plaatst	0	Info
Total:	83	

Table 7: Discussion Threads within no common category

Discussion Thread Title	Posts	Content / Theme:
Animo voor officiële WIDM-dvd boxen?	21	Wish for WIDM DVDs
Statisticus/wiskundige gezocht voor een interview	20	Call for Mole Mathematician
Behind the scenes	3	Wish for Behind the Scenes
Total	44	

Attachment C: Translation of the forum posts

Within the third chapter of this thesis, one finds English citations from Wieisdemol.com. As this is a Dutch fan site, all the used citations were Dutch. To give transparency to the research, one can find in here the original Dutch quote accompanied by my translation to English. The numbers in front of the quotes are the numbers the quotes are referred to in the footnotes of the third chapter.

Quote and translation 1:

Het is gewoon jammer dat dit forum in een grote klaagforum is veranderd.[118]

It's just too bad that this forum has become mainly a forum for complaining

Quote and translation 2:

Zoals vanouds kunnen jullie na iedere aflevering handelingen van kandidaten beoordelen als mols of onmols. Als een handeling veel mols-stemmen krijgt, krijgen kandidaten die die handeling doen, molpunten. Als jullie iets onmols vinden, gaan er bij die kandidaten punten af. De aanname waar deze theorie van uitgaat is dat de mol molse dingen doet, en dus veel molpunten vergaart. Kandidaten met veel molpunten zijn dus verdacht.[119]

As usual, after each episode you can decide [through votes] which actions are suspious or not. When an action gets a lot of votes, the contestant who did this action, gets Mole-points. When an action is unsuspicious, this contestants loses Mole-points. The assumption of this theory is that the Mole acts suspicious and so gathers a lot of Mole-points. Contestants with a lot of Mole-points are therefore suspicious.

Quote and translation 3:

Jeej Vriendlief! Blijft een molhoogtepuntje[120].

Yay! Vriendlief! This is always is one of the Mole's highlights!

Quote and translation 4:

Ik zou pleiten voor meer complexe/uitdagende opdrachten, deze duidelijker in beeld brengen, meer nuchtere beeldvoering, meer de groep laten zien en wat daar in om gaat. Laat de presentator eens lekker samen eten met de kandidaten en stop daar een minuut van in de aflevering.[121]

---

[118] '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum/index.php?topic=60039.20.
[119] '*Molpunten 2017 – uitslag bekend*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum/index.php?topic=60043.0.
[120] '*Vriendliefjes !*', http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum/index.php?topic=60306.20.
[121] *Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum/index.php?topic=60039.80.

I would argue for more complex/ambitious challenges and show these better, for more neutral editing and for more screen time of the group's process. Let the host and the contestants dine together and show one minute of that footage in the episode.

Quote and translation 5:

Ik weet niet of 'alles vroeger beter was', maar ik merk wel dat ik de spanning in de opdrachten mis: een rare psychologische twist die in eerdere seizoenen wel aanwezig was, naar mijn idee.[122]

I don't know if 'the past is always better', but I do know that I miss the thrill within the challenges: a weird psychological twist which did exist in earlier seasons in my opinion.

Quote and translation 6:

Ik ben nog steeds fan van het programma, maar de Nederlandse WIDM is teveel het spoor bijster geraakt van waar het programma ooit om draaide. Mooie natuur is echt hartstikke prima, en vind ik ook gaaf, maar dat moet makkelijk samen kunnen gaan met boeiende opdrachten.[123]

I'm still a fan of the format, but the Dutch WIDM really lost focus on the essence of the show. Beautiful locations is completely fine, and I do like that, but it has to go hand in hand with interesting challenges.

Quote and translation 7:

Het zegt genoeg dat de Mol België vorig jaar een echte verademing was[124]

It's says all there it to say when the Belgian Wie is de Mol was a real relief last year.

Quote and translation 8:

En de belgen doen dat [spannende groepsdynamiek] beter dan 'wij' in mijn optiek[125]

And the Belgians do that [exciting group dynamic] better then 'we' do in my opinion.

Quote and translation 9:

Wat ik me dus afvraag: hoe kijkt de "gemiddelde" molloot naar seizoen 16? [126]

---

[122] '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum/index.php?topic=60039.300.
[123] '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum/index.php?topic=60039.300.
[124] '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum/index.php?topic=60039.300.
[125] '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum/index.php?topic=60039.180.
[126] '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum/index.php?topic=60039.40.

What I ask myself: how does an average WIDM fan watch season 16?

Quote and translation 10:

Aflevering 5 was voor mij nu wel meer een aflevering voor de 'doorsnee' kijker[127]

Episode 5 was for me more of an episode for the 'average' viewer

Quote and translation 11:

Ik ga er van uit dat het "gewone" publiek er anders naar kijkt dan de "forummers".[128]

I assume that "normal" people watch it [WIDM] in a different way than the "forum users"

Quote and translation 12:

Bij een miljoenenpubliek kun je niet verwachten dat iedereen allerlei twists en diepere bedoelingen bij de opdrachten ziet of waardeert, maar een paar opdrachten kunnen gerust wat diepgaander of ingewikkelder zijn[129]

With an audience of millions of people, you cannot expect that everyone gets or likes twists and deeper meaning, but a few more challenges could very well be complex or have this deeper meaning.

Quote and translation 13:

Iedereen moet nu zijn gerak krijgen: de molloten (grof gezegd, de mensen zoals hier op het forum) en de 'gewone' kijker. Dat zijn twee totaal verschillende categorieën met totaal verschillende belangen[130]

Everyone must get what they want: the WIDM fans (or, stated boldly, the people here on this forum) and the 'normal' viewer. This are two completely different categories with completely different interests

Quote and translation 14:

Ik heb de indruk dat de makers, nu Wie is de Mol zó populair is geworden, het programma niet té ingewikkeld willen maken.[131]

I have the impression that the producer, now Wie is de Mol has gotten very popular, don't want to make the show too complex

Quote and translation 15:

De kritiek op dit programma komt voort uit liefde voor het programma[132]

[127] '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum/index.php?topic=60039.180.
[128] '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum/index.php?topic=60039.140.
[129] '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum/index.php?topic=60039.300.
[130] '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum/index.php?topic=60039.120.
[131] '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum/index.php?topic=60039.320.
[132] '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen*,' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum/index.php?topic=60039.200.

The <u>critique</u> on the show is fuelled by the <u>love</u> for the show.

Quote and translation 16:

Ik denk dat het al duidelijk genoeg is gezegd door de meeste criticasters dat die kritiek niet als afbreuk aan t programma Moet worden gezien, maar als aanzet tot verbetering. Omdat ze iets missen in t programma en daar ligt nu net de crux voor dit forum.[133]

I think that most of the critical users said it, but the critique is not to insult the show, but as a means to improve it. They miss something and that is what this forum comes into play

---

[133] '*Kritische noot over het huidige seizoen,*' http://www.wieisdemol.com/forum/index.php?topic=60039.200.

Attachment D: Declaration of Intellectual Property

Verklaring Intellectueel Eigendom

De Universiteit Utrecht definieert plagiaat als volgt:

Plagiaat is het overnemen van stukken, gedachten, redeneringen van anderen en deze laten doorgaan voor eigen werk.

De volgende zaken worden in elk geval als plagiaat aangemerkt:

- het knippen en plakken van tekst van digitale bronnen zoals encyclopedieën of digitale tijdschriften zonder aanhalingstekens en verwijzing;
- het knippen en plakken van teksten van het internet zonder aanhalingstekens en verwijzing;
- het overnemen van gedrukt materiaal zoals boeken, tijdschriften of encyclopedieën zonder aanhalingstekens of verwijzing;
- het opnemen van een vertaling van teksten van anderen zonder aanhalingstekens en verwijzing (zogenaamd "vertaalplagiaat");
- het parafraseren van teksten van anderen zonder verwijzing. Een parafrase mag nooit bestaan uit louter vervangen van enkele woorden door synoniemen;
- het overnemen van beeld-, geluids- of testmateriaal van anderen zonder verwijzing en zodoende laten doorgaan voor eigen werk;
- het overnemen van werk van andere studenten en dit laten doorgaan voor eigen werk. Indien dit gebeurt met toestemming van de andere student is de laatste medeplichtig aan plagiaat;
- het indienen van werkstukken die verworven zijn van een commerciële instelling (zoals een internetsite met uittreksels of papers) of die al dan niet tegen betaling door iemand anders zijn geschreven.

Ik heb bovenstaande definitie van plagiaat zorgvuldig gelezen en verklaar hierbij dat ik mij in het aangehechte BA-eindwerkstuk niet schuldig gemaakt heb aan plagiaat.

Tevens verklaar ik dat dit werkstuk niet ingeleverd is/zal worden voor een andere cursus, in de huidige of in aangepaste vorm.

Naam: Ruud Dielen

Studentnummer: 5484359

Plaats: Utrecht

Datum: 22-06-2017

Handtekening: