

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Power, Knowledge and Resistance in African Media

Ofori-Birikorang Ama Boatemaa ¹

School of Media Arts & Studies, Ohio University, Athens

Email: ao802221@ohio.edu

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0008-3080-2676>

Article History

Received 2025-12-10

Revised 2026-01-22

Accepted 2026-02-19

Published 2026-03-03

Keywords

Discourse

Ghana

Media

Power/knowledge

Resistance

How to cite

Ofori-Birikorang A.B. (2026). Power, Knowledge and Resistance in African Media. *Adom Social Science and Humanities Journal*, 2(1): 495-517.

Copyright © 2026 The Author(s)



Abstract

This paper advances a critical synthesis of Michel Foucault's theory of power/knowledge for media analysis, with specific attention to how "truth" is produced, stabilized, and contested within contemporary media institutions. It argues that media should be treated as a primary site where power circulates through discourse, institutional routines, and disciplinary techniques that shape what becomes visible, credible, and socially actionable. The paper evaluates key debates on whether Foucauldian power permits meaningful resistance, clarifying the status of agency within power relations and specifying what counts as resistance beyond celebratory claims. It then applies these theoretical disputes to the Ghanaian media landscape by identifying community radio and grassroots digital platforms as contested spaces where local knowledge can be articulated against dominant commercial and political narratives. The analysis stresses that resistance cannot be assumed; it must be examined through evidence of institutional disruption, narrative reconfiguration, audience uptake, and sustainability. Building on this critique, the paper proposes an agenda for future research that tests power/knowledge claims through institutional analysis of ownership, regulation, and newsroom practice, alongside audience research and platform governance studies that track how algorithmic visibility and moderation reshape public discourse. By refining Foucauldian concepts for media scholarship and linking them to concrete sites of media production and contestation, the paper clarifies how media power works,

why it persists, and where it becomes vulnerable to challenge in Ghana and comparable contexts.

Introduction

The theory of power and knowledge, as developed by Michel Foucault, centers on the complex relationship between power and knowledge and how they operate within various social, political, and institutional contexts (Foucault & Gordon, 1980). Foucault's theory challenges traditional notions of power as solely repressive or hierarchical and highlights the productive and constructive aspects of power. According to Foucault (1980), power is not a fixed entity held by a particular individual or group, but rather a pervasive and dynamic force that permeates all social relations. Also, power is not simply exercised from the top-down but operates in a network of relationships, circulating and being enacted by individuals at various levels of society (Foucault, 1980). Poorghorban (2023) also notes that power, according to Foucault, is not solely negative or oppressive but can also be productive, shaping and influencing knowledge, discourse, and social practices. Thus, power and knowledge are intimately connected and mutually constitutive, hence, knowledge does not exist independently of power but is shaped by it. Manokha (2009) adds that power structures determine what knowledge is produced, circulated, and accepted within a given society. Knowledge, in turn, reinforces and legitimates existing power structures, serving to maintain and perpetuate them (Manokha, 2009).

In this framework, Foucault (1980) emphasizes the role of discourses and institutions in the production and dissemination of knowledge. Discourse functions as a mechanism for shaping particular truths and understandings, permeating all facets of social environments. Power is frequently wielded through different discourses, yet they are not exclusively controlled by any specific group or those in authority (Foucault, 2010; Poorghorban, 2023). Furthermore, discourse can operate as a means of challenging prevailing power dynamics, serving as a form of resistance (Foucault, 2010). Institutions such as the media are key sites where power and knowledge intersect, as they regulate and control individuals through disciplinary mechanisms. Foucault's theory also highlights the ways in which power operates on and through the body, so, power relations are embodied and enacted through bodily practices, norms, and technologies (Dews, 1984). The regulation of sexuality, health, and bodily behavior becomes a means through which power is exercised, shaping individuals' subjectivities and identities. Furthermore, Foucault's theory recognizes the agency of individuals within power relations. While power constraints and shapes individuals, it also allows for resistance and contestation (Foucault, 2010). Individuals and groups can challenge and subvert existing power structures through various forms of resistance, creating spaces for alternative knowledge and practices to emerge.

This theory is relevant because Foucault offers a critical analysis of power that moves beyond traditional notions of power as a purely repressive or hierarchical force, instead conceptualizing power as productive, relational, and dispersed throughout social institutions

(Foucault, 1978, 1980). The theory of power/knowledge highlights the complex and multifaceted nature of power in society, emphasizing its pervasive presence and its operation through discursive formations that produce regimes of truth (Foucault, 1972, 1980). This perspective prompts critical examination of dominant knowledge systems, their historical formation, and their implications for the maintenance of power relations (Foucault, 1972). Foucault further argues that where there is power, there is resistance, suggesting that individuals and groups possess the capacity to contest and disrupt dominant discourses (Foucault, 1978, 1982). Applied to media contexts, this framework supports the view that audiences are not merely passive recipients of media messages but can exercise interpretive agency and resist dominant narratives (Fiske, 1987; Kellner, 1995). It also encourages critical engagement with media content through interrogation of discourses and exploration of alternative or counter-hegemonic information sources (Hall, 1997; Couldry & Curran, 2003).

Understanding the power dynamics embedded within media institutions enables audiences and activists to challenge symbolic and structural forms of media power (Couldry, 2000). In this sense, Foucault's framework has informed scholarship on alternative and radical media practices aimed at contesting entrenched power structures within media systems (Atton, 2002; Downing, 2001).

This theory is pertinent for understanding how power operates within media institutions, revealing that what is presented as objective fact or truth is often shaped by those in positions of power, and how activists, through resistance, seek to democratize media access, broaden representation, and advocate for diverse voices and viewpoints. Foucault's theory also provides a conceptual foundation for critiquing and reshaping media practices, thereby contributing to the creation of a more inclusive and equitable media environment. Applying Foucault's theory to the Ghanaian media landscape prompts an examination of alternative and community media platforms. Community radio stations and grassroots-run online platforms exemplify Foucault's theory in action. These platforms empower local communities to voice concerns, share indigenous knowledge, and contest dominant commercial media narratives, serving as sites of resistance against mainstream power structures (Myers, 2011). Advocating for the promotion and support of such platforms in Ghana can amplify diverse perspectives and foster a more inclusive media environment.

Summary Discussion

Hobbs (2008) studies the enduring intellectual legacy of Michel Foucault and his significant contributions to the realms of social and cultural inquiry. He analyzes the implications of Foucault's theories for empirical research, epistemology, and ontology within the social sciences. Hobbs (2008) recognizes Michel Foucault's theories as highly influential and impactful within the realms of social and cultural inquiry. He acknowledges Foucault's position as an intellectual giant and a prominent figure in the postmodern school of thought. Foucault's extensive oeuvre is described as forcing scholars to reflect on the assumptions underlying their empirical endeavors and to pay attention to matters of epistemology and

ontology (Harrison, 1992). Hobbs (2008) citing Hoy (1988) emphasizes that Foucault's ideas challenge traditional culturalist notions and offer radical epistemological decenterings of knowledge and truth. Foucault's theories are seen as transcending traditional categorizations such as structuralism, post-structuralism, and phenomenology, rather, described as a culturalist reading of modernity that is historically grounded and supported by empirical inquiry. Furthermore, Hobbs (2008) highlights Foucault's emphasis on discourse and discursive formations which is seen as linking culture to representation and media texts. Thus, Foucault's exploration of the effects of discourse, knowledge, and power on society and individuals provides a framework for understanding the complexities of media and its role in shaping cultural and sociopolitical landscapes. Hobbs' (2008) study acknowledges that Foucault's primary focus was not on the mass media, and he was not a sociologist, however, his conceptual tools and approaches can be applied to studying the mass media. Hobbs (2008) further suggests that Foucault's perspectives on the construction of truth, power relations, and the role of discourse in shaping knowledge are valuable for analyzing media representations and their broader societal implications.

Naraghi (2012) acknowledges the controversial nature of Foucault's conception of power, which has sparked extensive debates since its inception in the 1970s. According to Naraghi (2012), scholars like Bevir (1999) have offered differing viewpoints on whether Foucault's theory allows for resistance against power or if power is invulnerable to any form of challenge. To understand Foucault's stance on resistance, Harcourt (2011) posits that it is crucial to understand his conception of power and how Foucault (1980) situates his theory in relation to Marxism and Nietzsche's perspectives on power. Additionally, Naraghi (2012) discusses Foucault's (1980) theory of power and the notion of resistance in two major parts. Firstly, Foucault's (1977) understanding of power is elucidated through an analysis of his seminal work, "Discipline and Punish." In this book, Foucault (1977) conducts a genealogical study of crime and punishment in Europe, contrasting two distinct scenes. The first scene portrays a gruesome execution characterized by public torture, while the second scene depicts the detailed regulation of prisoners' daily activities without physical pain or execution (Foucault, 1977). Foucault argues that the shift from overt physical punishment to more subtle forms of control signify a transformation in the exercise of power. According to Foucault, power no longer focuses solely on punishing the body but aims to supervise and control the individual at a deeper level (Naraghi, 2012). This shift in disciplinary techniques gives rise to the concept of the "docile body." Foucault explains that through various mechanisms of discipline, such as hierarchical observation, normalizing judgment, and examination, bodies can be subjected, transformed, and improved to conform to desired behaviors and norms (Foucault, 1977). This process of discipline extends beyond prisons and permeates society, manifesting in institutions like factories, hospitals, and schools. Foucault (1977) terms this pervasive network of disciplinary mechanisms the carceral archipelago.

By examining Foucault's later essay, "The Subject and Power," Naraghi (2012) explains deeper into Foucault's understanding of power relations in modern society. Here, Foucault (1982)

posits that the modern state, as a form of political power, has evolved from an older form of power known as "pastoral power." Pastoral power operates by looking into individuals' minds, exploring their souls, and directing their innermost secrets (Foucault, 1982). Again, Foucault (1982) argues that the modern state integrates individuals rather than disregarding their existence, acting as a sophisticated structure that governs and controls. Within this framework, the notion of resistance against power becomes a significant point of inquiry. Naraghi (2012) states that some scholars argue that resistance takes on a distinct character within Foucault's framework, different from conventional discourses of power. Naraghi (2012) acknowledges these differing perspectives and highlights the complexities surrounding the possibility and nature of resistance within Foucault's theory.

Allen (2017) discusses how Foucault's ideas align with the notion of epistemic injustice, which involves examining the entanglements of reason with social power. Foucault focuses on the dangers and historical effects of rationality in relation to social power and emphasizes the ways in which power and knowledge intersect, without reducing reason to power (Allen, 2017). In the article, Allen (2017) identifies the three core features of Foucault's work identified as particularly relevant to discussions of epistemic injustice. First, Foucault's analysis of power as both constitutive and agential provides perspectives into the relationship between testimonial and hermeneutical injustices. Second, his exploration of power/knowledge regimes sheds light on how they shape our understanding of truth and contribute to hermeneutical injustices. Finally, his concept of genealogy as a form of counter-memory offers a model of resistance against epistemic injustices. Allen (2017) further explores Foucault's understanding of power, distinguishing it from traditional notions of power as an innate capacity of individuals or a binary domination. Instead, power is described as a strategic, relational phenomenon that operates throughout society. Foucault's perspective emphasizes that power is exercised over free subjects within a field of possibilities (Allen, 2017).

The analysis of power by Allen (2017) is complemented by Foucault's notion of subjection, which explores how actual relations of subjugation manufacture subjects, rather than starting with presuppositions about individual rights and legitimacy. According to Foucault, resistance is an inherent part of power relations so, wherever there is power, there is also resistance (Allen, 2017). However, Foucault emphasizes that resistance is always internal to power relations, meaning it operates within the existing power structures rather than being external or transcendent to them (Medina, 2011). Foucault's notion of genealogy, which is a form of counter-memory, is presented as a compelling model of resistance to epistemic injustices (Medina, 2011). Genealogy involves articulating subjugated knowledge and challenging dominant power/knowledge regimes. By uncovering marginalized or silenced perspectives and histories, genealogy aims to disrupt and challenge oppressive systems of knowledge and power. Therefore, Allen (2017) proposes that resistance, as conceived by Foucault, is an important aspect of power relations and can serve as a means to resist and challenge

epistemic injustices by uncovering alternative knowledge and questioning dominant forms of power and knowledge.

Similarly, Heller (1996) addresses issues of power, subjectification, and resistance as conceptualized by Michel Foucault. The author explores these interconnected concepts that are central to Foucault's theoretical framework. Heller (1996) begins by highlighting the significance of power, subjectification, and resistance in Foucault's work, emphasizing their complexity and the challenges in translating them into more familiar theoretical forms. He points out the lack of serious debate and the existence of a widely accepted interpretation of Foucault's ideas, which the author aims to challenge. Heller (1996) examines the seemingly paradoxical statement by Foucault that power relations are both intentional and non-subjective. He critiques interpretations that focus solely on power's non-subjective aspects, neglecting its intentional dimension. The author argues for a more balanced understanding that recognizes both intentionality and non-subjectivity in power relations. Heller (1996) further explains how Foucault's proposition that subjectification involves the constitution of subjects through power relations and challenges the notion that subjectivity is a homogeneous process in which individuals are merely passive objects of power. Foucault allows for the creation of both hegemonic and counter-hegemonic subject-positions (Heller, 1996).

Heller (1996) highlights the reversibility of power mechanisms and the heterogeneous processes of subjectification as grounds for resistance. The author rejects the notion that Foucault's vision of power leads to a monolithic determinism, instead emphasizing the possibilities for resistance. Lastly, the paper explores Foucault's concept of freedom, illustrating how it enables a distinction between liberated power relations and those involving domination. It suggests that Foucault's conception of modernity is not inherently dystopian, contrary to prevailing interpretations. These arguments collectively contribute to a critical examination and reinterpretation of Foucault's concepts of power, subjectification, and resistance, challenging the existing consensus in Foucault scholarship and providing alternative perspectives on these fundamental ideas.

Haugaard (2022) presents a critique of Foucault's concepts of power, power-knowledge, and discipline, arguing that they are one-sided. He argues that while Foucault claims that power has no central locus and is not solely top-down or structural, Foucault overlooks the interactive and enabling aspects of power. According to the author, a more balanced view should recognize the presence of meaningful agency, social structures as interactive creations, social knowledge that encompasses both reifying truth claims and enabling knowledge, and the social-ontological being-in-the-social-world as both enabling and dominating. Haugaard (2022) also addresses Foucault's training and his relationship with sociological theory highlighting Foucault's background in philosophy rather than sociology, which, in the author's view, limits the depth of his sociological analysis. Although Foucault probes sociological issues, Haugaard (2022) argues that Foucault's work lacks a sophisticated grounding in sociological theory, suggesting that a more robust engagement with

sociological perspectives would enhance his analysis. Moreover, Haugaard (2022) also explores Foucault's perspective on the relationship between power and truth. Foucault's work shifts the focus from seeking the surest path to truth to understanding the historical context and effects of truth, intertwined with relations of power. The author interprets Foucault's reframing of the problem of truth from a philosophical concern of epistemology to a sociological problem of social practice. This shift highlights the role of actors in utilizing truth claims and emphasizes the sociological dimensions of truth and knowledge.

Comparisons are drawn between Foucault's empirical works and the ideas of Émile Durkheim, a prominent sociologist. Foucault's works on changing practices of knowledge, such as "The Order of Things" and "The Archaeology of Knowledge," resonate with Durkheim's (1995) ideas presented in "Elementary Forms of Religious Life." Both Foucault (1970) and Durkheim (1995) challenge the universal character of Western knowledge, emphasizing its social construction. However, Haugaard (2002) notes that Durkheim's (1995) conclusions, influenced by cognitive linguistics, offer a more nuanced understanding of the social construction of thought categories compared to Foucault's historical approach. Moreover, Haugaard (2022) highlights the absence of sociological references in Foucault's genealogical works, such as "Discipline and Punish" and "Society Must Be Defended." Haugaard (2022) finds it perplexing that Foucault overlooks sociological perspectives and fails to engage with sociologists like Max Weber, who have made significant contributions to the understanding of power and social structures. Again, these genealogical works address themes that have been extensively examined in sociology, particularly the emergence of the modern social subject through power, discipline, bureaucracy, and the state (Haugaard, 2022).

Lekssays (2017) focuses on the critical debate between renowned philosophers Michel Foucault and Jürgen Habermas on the concept of power and its profound influence on media. In this discourse lies the fundamental question of how power operates within society and the various perspectives offered by these two influential thinkers. Foucault's conceptualization of power stands in contrast to the traditional Marxist and liberal views that limit it to the domain of the bourgeoisie or the state (Foucault, 1980). Alternatively, Foucault envisions power as a productive, cross-level relationship that permeates every aspect of society- reaching into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and everyday lives (Foucault, 1980). This expansive understanding of power underlines Foucault's interest in the freedom and behavior of individuals under varying circumstances. To explain his perspective, Foucault identifies three distinct forms of power: sovereign power, disciplinary power, and pastoral power (Foucault 1977, 2007).

Sovereign power is typically associated with obedience to the rules and those in charge of managing society, while disciplinary power refers to the mechanisms that regulate the behavior of individuals within the social fabric (Foucault, 2007). Foucault's concept of the panopticon, a circular prison design that facilitates constant surveillance, serves as a powerful metaphor for understanding how disciplinary power shapes individual actions through the

internalization of the “gaze” of the observer (Panneerselvam, 2000). Crucially, Foucault argues that power and knowledge are inextricably linked, with knowledge serving as a form of power that can be wielded to regulate and discipline practices (Lekssays, 2017). This power-knowledge relationship underlines Foucault’s belief that knowledge, once applied in the real world, has tangible effects, and becomes true.

In contrast to Foucault’s expansive view of power, Habermas (2014) gives a critique of his perspective, advocating for his own ideas on communicative rationality and discourse ethics as alternative ways of conceptualizing the dynamics of power. Habermas’s contribution to the debate also includes his influential concept of the public sphere, which highlights the importance of media in facilitating open and inclusive public discourse (Habermas, 2014). Lekssays (2017) astutely points out the significance of power as a critical variable that shapes the operation of media within a given society. If power is seen as an absolute tool that cannot be challenged, the media can become a mere instrument in the hands of the regime, used to manipulate public opinion and conceal information that could potentially question its authority. Conversely, if power is understood as a tool to protect and amplify the voices of the people, media can flourish as a free and essential element in the growth and development of a nation. By exploring the thought-provoking debate between Foucault and Habermas, Lekssays (2017) provides a comprehensive exploration of the complex relationship between power, media, and the broader societal dynamics that underpin them. This intellectual discourse serves as a useful framework for understanding the multifaceted nature of power and its far-reaching implications on the media landscape.

Critical Assessment

Michael and Still’s (1992) study reveals a nuanced exploration of the relationship between power, knowledge, and resistance. The authors challenge traditional notions of reason and objectivity, suggesting that knowledge is not universal but rather shaped by cultural contexts and institutional influences (Michael & Still, 1992). This deconstruction of the myth of objective reason is crucial in understanding how power operates within systems of knowledge production. One of the strengths of the study is its emphasis on various forms of resistance to established power structures. By drawing upon the ideas of Foucault (1980), Michael and Still (1992) highlight the agency of individuals in resisting disciplinary power. They argue that resistance is not futile but can be achieved through the assertion of will and freedom (Michael & Still, 1992). This perspective provides a hopeful outlook, suggesting that even within systems of power, individuals have the capacity to challenge and subvert oppressive structures. Moreover, the critique of the Cartesian metaphor of knowledge as detached observation is particularly insightful. The Cartesian metaphor, rooted in the philosophy of René Descartes, conceptualizes the relationship between the mind and the external world as one of detachment and objectivity (Michael & Still, 1992). The authors propose alternative metaphors that emphasize the active engagement of individuals with their environment and the embodied nature of human experience.

Moreover, drawing from philosophers like Hegel, Merleau-Ponty, and Husserl, Michael and Still (1992) advocate for a more comprehensive understanding of human perception and action. This revised understanding of human experience offers a foundation for resistance to control by power and knowledge, highlighting the importance of considering the active role of individuals in shaping their realities. Again, the introduction of the concept of affordance, inspired by the work of James Gibson, adds another layer to the analysis. Affordances refer to the action possibilities offered by the environment (Gibson, 1977), and the authors argue that recognizing these affordances can empower individuals to challenge power dynamics. By understanding the potential for action and intervention within their surroundings, individuals can resist the constraints imposed by power and knowledge. Michael and Still's (1992) work provides a thought-provoking analysis of power, knowledge, and resistance. By questioning traditional paradigms and proposing alternative frameworks, the authors contribute to a deeper understanding of how individuals navigate and challenge systems of power in society. Their emphasis on agency, embodiment, and perception reveals the dynamics of resistance and the possibilities for social change.

Also, Brighenti (2011) presents a comprehensive analysis of resistance, power, and social transformation, challenging conventional understanding and proposing a perspective that draws from various theoretical traditions. The study's critical examination of the dichotomy between materialist and culturalist perspectives on resistance is significant. By acknowledging the limitations of this binary framework, the author highlights the complexities of material actions and symbolic challenges within power relations. This recognition of the multifaceted nature of resistance enriches individual understanding of how societies and groups engage with systems of domination and oppression. Moreover, Brighenti (2011) effectively utilizes the theoretical frameworks of Elias Canetti and Michel Foucault to deepen the analysis of resistance. Canetti's emphasis on the creative and transformative aspects of resistance provides a remarkable counterpoint to more traditional views that portray resistance solely as oppositional or reactive (Canetti, 1973). By drawing on Canetti's ideas, the study expands the conceptualization of resistance to include its constructive and generative dimensions.

Similarly, the engagement with Foucault's analysis of power and resistance adds depth to the discussion by highlighting the immanent nature of resistance within power relations. Foucault's conception of power as productive and constitutive, rather than solely repressive, resonates with Brighenti's (2011) argument that resistance is not external to power but emerges within its networks. This perspective encourages a re-evaluation of resistance as a site of negotiation, transformation, and alternative practices, rather than just a means of overthrowing existing power structures. Brighenti's (2011) study contributes significantly to the ongoing discourse on resistance and power, offering a multifaceted perspective that challenges conventional wisdom and opens new avenues for theoretical and practical exploration.

Thorpe (2017) gives a detailed and critical examination of the arguments put forth by Jérôme E. Roos regarding Michel Foucault's philosophy and its implications for revolutionary action. Thorpe (2017) acknowledges the commendable intentions of Roos in sparking a vital debate on Left intellectual strategy and its implications for praxis. However, he fundamentally disagrees with Roos' interpretation of Foucault's theory and proceeds to present a counterargument. One noteworthy aspect of the article is Thorpe's (2017) defense of the complexity and specialized language employed by Foucault. He argues that the nature of complex ideas necessitates a precise language to effectively convey their depth and originality. Drawing a parallel to Karl Marx's "Das Kapital," he suggests that Foucault, in his pursuit of challenging established systems of power and knowledge, deliberately chooses his words carefully. Thorpe (2017) contends that simplified and reductionist versions of Foucault's ideas, though seemingly easier to refute, can be problematized through a more thorough reading of his extensive body of work, similar to common criticisms of Marx. Also, he mentions Foucault's concept of resistance, which is an inherent and inevitable component of power relations. The author emphasizes that resistance is not external to power but rather an integral part of it. By quoting Foucault's assertion that where there is power, there is resistance, Thorpe (2017) asserts that resistance is not only a possibility but a force that continually shapes and transforms power relations. This challenges Roos' (2014) claim that revolutionary action is precluded by Foucault's philosophy, as Thorpe (2017) contends that power is constantly compelled to adapt and change in response to resistance.

Furthermore, Thorpe (2017) argues that revolution, while contingent and difficult to define, is always possible within Foucault's framework. Resistive tensions constitute power and reside at its core, and that power is perpetually lagging the nimble and creative actions of resistance. Drawing on Antonio Negri's perspective, which combines Foucauldian power analysis with a revolutionary understanding of class and capitalism, Thorpe (2017) supports the view that revolution is not only feasible but deeply intertwined with resistive movements. However, the article also acknowledges certain limitations within Foucault's approach. Thorpe suggests that Foucault's focus on discursive power and the analysis of what powerful groups say about themselves may overlook the actual practices and material effects of power. The author points to the example of neoliberalism, where professed ideologies and goals often diverge from the actual practices and consequences. Thorpe (2017) argues that a more thorough analysis would involve examining this discrepancy and the material manifestations of power.

Additionally, concerns were raised about the limitations of identity politics and new social movements influenced by Foucault's emphasis on discursive power. While recognizing the valuable contributions of these movements, the author cautions against viewing them as totalizing theories of society or as capable of achieving systematic anti-capitalist revolutions (Thorpe, 2017). The author argues that these movements should be seen as important and necessary components of resistance, but not as comprehensive solutions to the complex challenges posed by power structures. Hence, the article provides a detailed assessment of Roos' arguments and defends the potential for resistance and revolutionary action within

Foucault's theory. It highlights the importance of complex language in conveying intricate ideas, emphasizes the inherent nature of resistance in power relations, and explores the possibilities of revolution.

Zeeshan (n.d.), on the other hand, provides an analysis of media representation through the lens of Michel Foucault's discourse theory. An important aspect of the study is its exploration of the constructed nature of media representation. By highlighting that media content is carefully curated and shaped, the author challenges the notion of media as a neutral reflection of reality. However, the study emphasizes the deliberate choices made in selecting, omitting, and presenting information, shedding light on the underlying politics inherent in media representation. Furthermore, the study effectively elucidates Foucault's concept of discourse and its role in shaping our understanding and experience of reality. By defining discourse as the systematic organization of language to convey values, ideologies, and beliefs, Zeeshan (n.d.) emphasizes how discourse defines what can be said, thought, and done within a particular context. This conceptual framework enriches understanding of media representation as not merely conveying information but actively constructing meaning and influencing social interactions. By asserting that power and knowledge are intimately intertwined, Zeeshan (n.d.) explains how the media, as a powerful institution, contributes to shaping knowledge and influencing public opinion.

Media representations are depicted as instruments of power that reinforce dominant narratives and ideologies, influencing individuals' perceptions of themselves and the world (Zeeshan, n.d.). This analysis gives significant understanding into the mechanisms through which power operates within media representation. While recognizing the dominance of certain discourses shaped by those in power, Zeeshan (n.d.) also appreciates the potential for resistance within discourses. Alternative voices and counter-narratives are depicted as challenging dominant discourses, disrupting established power dynamics, and paving the way for social change. This understanding of resistance within discourses adds depth to the paper's analysis and accentuates the importance of critically examining media representation.

PoReSo (2020) explores the complex relationship between knowledge and resistance in the contemporary political landscape. The study addresses the challenges posed by disinformation, the questioning of academic disciplines, and the personalized nature of scientific knowledge. PoReSo (2020) draws on theoretical perspectives from scholars such as Michel Foucault, Judith Butler, and feminist and decolonial perspectives to analyze the power dynamics inherent in knowledge production and its potential for resistance. The study examines the ways in which power and knowledge intersect, highlighting the role of knowledge in shaping social orders and benefiting certain groups while excluding others. The intersection of power and knowledge emphasizes that knowledge is not value-neutral but plays a significant role in creating and reproducing social orders that benefit certain groups at the expense of others. Knowledge can be a form of resistance. Knowledge production can serve as a way to challenge and speak back to power, identify cracks in dominant narratives,

and imagine alternative worlds (Baaz, 2017). The concept of "knowledge otherwise" is discussed, which refers to knowledge produced from epistemological perspectives that diverge from those embraced by existing power structures including perspectives from marginalized groups, indigenous views, and even certain populist discourses (PoReSo, 2020). Additionally, PoReSo (2020) emphasizes that knowledge as resistance involves questioning and challenging prevailing systems of power and knowledge, and it plays a role in enabling, defining, and limiting the operations of power.

PoReSo (2020) also emphasizes the idea that knowledge itself can be a form of power, as well as a tool for resistance against dominant discourses and structures of oppression. The discussion of hybridizations between resistance, power, and knowledge provides an understanding of the complexities involved in challenging prevailing worldviews and knowledge regimes. A notable aspect of the study is its recognition of the evolving nature of knowledge and its relationship to power. It acknowledges the influence of new technologies, such as social media platforms, in the dissemination of disinformation and the manipulation of narratives. PoReSo (2020) raises important questions regarding the potential of knowledge to disrupt oppressive structures and the ways in which power can shape and co-opt knowledge itself. However, while it highlights the role of power in knowledge production, it does not fully engage with the broader social, political, and economic contexts that shape the production and dissemination of knowledge. The study could have provided a more in-depth analysis of the structural inequalities and power imbalances that influence knowledge-making processes. Nonetheless, PoReSo's (2020) study is a thought-provoking analysis of knowledge and resistance as it effectively highlights the complexities and tensions involved in knowledge production and its potential for both reproducing and challenging power structures.

Evaluative Discussion

Michel Foucault's theory of power and knowledge provides a critical framework for understanding the complex dynamics at play within media institutions, discourses, and practices. By examining power, knowledge, and resistance, Foucault's theory offers a look into the ways in which media shape and is shaped by societal power structures. One of the key contributions of Foucault's theory is its challenge to traditional notions of power as solely repressive or hierarchical (Foucault, 1980). Foucault emphasizes the productive and constructive aspects of power. This perspective prompts us to critically examine dominant knowledge systems within the media, their origins, and their implications for power dynamics. It highlights the ways in which power operates in a network of relationships, circulating and being enacted by individuals at various levels of society. In the context of media, power is not simply exercised from the top-down, but is dispersed throughout various institutions, discourses, and practices (Foucault, 1998). Foucault's theory of power and knowledge is particularly relevant in understanding the construction and dissemination of media representations (McCoy, 1988; Zeeshan, n.d.). His emphasis on discourses and institutions as key sites where power and knowledge intersect sheds light on how media shapes our

understanding of the world. Discourses, as systems of language and representation, play a crucial role in framing and defining social issues, events, and identities. Media, as a powerful discursive institution, influences public discourse by selecting and framing certain narratives while excluding or marginalizing others.

By applying Foucault's theory to media phenomena, we can critically analyze how power operates within media institutions and how it influences the production, circulation, and acceptance of knowledge. Power structures within the media determine what information is deemed newsworthy, what perspectives are included or excluded, and what narratives are presented as objective truth. This analysis helps us recognize the biases and ideological underpinnings that shape media content, enabling us to approach media consumption with a more discerning eye. Furthermore, Foucault's theory highlights the ways in which power operates through disciplinary mechanisms within media institutions. Media institutions, such as news organizations, have the power to regulate and control individuals through various practices and technologies. These disciplinary mechanisms, including editorial policies, filtering processes, propaganda techniques, gatekeeping processes, and agenda-setting practices, shape the production and dissemination of knowledge within the media. They influence the selection of sources, the framing of news stories, and the prioritization of certain issues over others. This can be observed in the coverage of political events by mainstream media outlets.

In a situation where a media organization reports on a protest or demonstration, the framing, language used, and selection of images can significantly influence how the event is perceived by the audience. If the media outlet has close ties to political elites or corporate interests, their coverage may portray the protest in a negative light, emphasizing violence or disruption while downplaying the grievances of the protestors. This framing serves to delegitimize the protest and maintain the status quo by reinforcing existing power structures. On the other hand, independent or alternative media outlets might provide a different perspective, highlighting the underlying issues driving the protest and amplifying the voices of the protestors. Their coverage may contextualize the event within broader social and political dynamics, challenging the dominant narrative presented by mainstream media.

By applying Foucault's theory to analyze these media representations, we can uncover how power operates within media institutions to shape public perception and maintain existing hierarchies. The selective framing and presentation of information serve the interests of those in positions of power, while alternative perspectives offer a counter-narrative that challenges the status quo. Foucault's theory recognizes the agency of individuals within power relations (Balan, 2010). While power constraints and shapes individuals, it also allows for resistance and contestation. Individuals and groups can challenge and subvert existing power structures within the media through various forms of resistance, creating spaces for alternative knowledge and practices to emerge. Foucault's theory of power and knowledge helps uncover the ways in which power operates within media institutions and practices (Lekssays,

2017). The theory reveals that what is presented as objective fact or truth within the media is often shaped by those in positions of power.

Media representations and narratives are influenced by dominant power structures, which serve to maintain and perpetuate existing hierarchies (Curran, 2005). This critical analysis of power in media enables audiences to adopt a discerning approach to consumption and actively challenge oppressive or manipulative media practices. Foucault's framework also catalyzes media activism aimed at dismantling entrenched power structures within media systems. By recognizing the agency of individuals, the theory empowers media users to resist prevailing narratives and advocate for diverse voices and viewpoints. It encourages the exploration of alternative and community media platforms that amplify marginalized perspectives, voice local concerns, and contest dominant commercial media narratives. Community radio stations and grassroots-run online platforms exemplify Foucault's theory in action, as they provide spaces for resistance against mainstream power structures and foster a more inclusive media environment. A practical example of Foucault's theory can be seen in the rise of citizen journalism and alternative media platforms as a means of resistance against mainstream narratives and power structures. With the proliferation of digital technology and social media platforms, individuals and grassroots organizations across the continent have been able to challenge dominant media discourses and provide alternative perspectives on various issues.

In October 2023, the National Students for Justice in Palestine (SJP) posted a "call to action" on social media, specifically on their Instagram account, urging their student chapters to mobilize a "Day of Resistance" in support of the Palestinians following the terrorist attacks in Israel by Hamas (Panreck, 2023). The SJP's toolkit (includes information, strategies, and suggestions for organizing protests, disruptions, or educational events in support of the Palestinians), which was also posted on social media, provided guidance for their student groups to organize protests, disruptions, or educational events in support of the Palestinians. In addition to this, various colleges and universities, including Rutgers, the University of Virginia, Ohio State University, and others, announced demonstrations and "teach-ins" on social media platforms to show solidarity with the Palestinians. Therefore, social media was utilized as a means to spread awareness, organize actions, and mobilize support for the Palestinian cause, thus serving as a form of resistance. Again, in countries like Egypt and Tunisia, where authoritarian regimes tightly controlled the flow of information, citizen journalists used social media to share videos, photos, and eyewitness testimonies of protests, police brutality, and government crackdowns. These grassroots media efforts helped to amplify the voices of dissent and challenge the dominant narratives propagated by state-controlled media. Hence, during periods of political unrest, citizen journalists often use social media platforms like Twitter, Facebook, and WhatsApp to report on events and share information that may not be covered by traditional media outlets.

Another practical example where alternative media has been a tremendous platform for resistance to dominant media narratives is the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement in the

United States. During the BLM protests that gained significant momentum in 2020 following the killing of George Floyd, alternative media outlets and social media platforms played a crucial role in amplifying the voices of activists, organizers, and communities affected by police brutality and systemic racism (Chang & Ferrara, 2022). Black Lives Matter started as a social media post, which captured the mood and sparked action. The movement utilized social media platforms to organize protests, raise awareness, and mobilize supporters. The use of hashtags and sharing of videos and images helped amplify the message of the movement and attract global attention (Maqbool, 2020).

Now, the Black Lives Matter movement has evolved into a loose national and international network, with chapters spread across the US and around the globe, and social media played a significant role in connecting and coordinating these various chapters and supporters. Traditional mainstream media often framed protests and demonstrations through a narrow lens, focusing on isolated incidents of violence or property damage while overlooking the broader issues of racial injustice and police violence. In contrast, alternative media platforms provided more nuanced coverage, highlighting the underlying causes of systemic racism, and centering the experiences of Black and marginalized communities. These citizen reporters, often operating independently or as part of activist networks, play a crucial role in disseminating information, documenting human rights abuses, and mobilizing support for social and political change.

Furthermore, alternative media outlets and community-run platforms have emerged to address the lack of diversity and representation in mainstream media. Alternative media is described as situated outside of the mainstream and articulating a social order that is different from and often opposed to the dominant narrative presented by mainstream media. It is seen as a platform that allows for the expression of diverse perspectives and contributes to a more engaged and mutual understanding of society (Kenix, 2011). These outlets prioritize issues that are often marginalized or ignored by mainstream media, such as rural development, environmental conservation, and grassroots activism. By amplifying the voices of marginalized communities and providing a platform for alternative perspectives, these media organizations contribute to a more inclusive and democratic public discourse. By engaging with alternative media sources, individuals in Africa can access a wider range of viewpoints, challenge dominant narratives, and participate in shaping media agendas. This form of resistance enables citizens to reclaim their agency in the production and dissemination of knowledge, ultimately contributing to greater transparency, accountability, and social justice across the continent.

Conclusion

The relevance of Foucault's theory lies in its critical analysis of power, moving beyond traditional notions and highlighting the complex and multifaceted nature of power in society. It prompts a critical examination of dominant knowledge systems, their origins, and their implications for power dynamics. It also empowers individuals by recognizing their agency

and capacity to resist prevailing narratives and encourages critical engagement with media content. By understanding the power dynamics inherent in media, audiences can adopt a discerning approach to consumption and challenge oppressive or manipulative media practices. Foucault's theory is pertinent for understanding how power operates within media institutions. It reveals that what is presented as objective fact or truth is often shaped by those in positions of power. It also provides a conceptual foundation for critiquing and reshaping media practices, contributing to the creation of a more inclusive and equitable media environment. Applying Foucault's theory to the Ghanaian media landscape, for example, prompts an examination of alternative and community media platforms that amplify diverse perspectives and foster a more inclusive media environment.

In a larger context, Foucault's theory of power and knowledge has had a significant impact on social and cultural inquiry. His ideas have influenced scholars in various fields, challenging traditional assumptions and prompting reflection on matters of epistemology and ontology. Foucault's exploration of power, discourse, and knowledge has provided a framework for understanding the complexities of media and its role in shaping cultural and sociopolitical landscapes. His theories have been applied to the study of media representations and their broader societal implications. Furthermore, Foucault's conception of power and resistance has sparked debates and discussions on the possibilities and nature of resistance within power structures. Thus, Foucault's work has contributed to critical analyses of power dynamics, knowledge production, and social institutions, informing efforts to create more inclusive and democratic societies.

To address the issues discussed by scholars regarding the theory of power and knowledge by Michel Foucault, I propose that firstly, it is important to promote and support alternative and community media platforms. These platforms play a significant role in amplifying diverse perspectives and challenging mainstream narratives. By providing resources, funding, and institutional support for such platforms, marginalized voices can be heard, and a more inclusive media environment can be encouraged. Also, it is important to promote media activism as it is essential in dismantling entrenched power structures within media systems. This involves advocating for broad representation, democratizing media access, and supporting diverse voices and viewpoints. Grassroots organizations can be supported, and collaboration between activists and media professionals can be facilitated to create spaces for marginalized communities to share their stories and challenge oppressive practices. Advocacy efforts should be made to promote policies that enable a more inclusive and equitable media environment. This can include advocating for media regulations that promote diversity, representation, and accountability.

Additionally, supporting policies that ensure equal access to media platforms and resources for marginalized communities is crucial. Also, media organizations and professionals should be encouraged to adopt ethical guidelines and practices that prioritize accuracy, fairness, and inclusivity. Finally, encouraging collaboration and dialogue such as open discussions, partnerships, and knowledge-sharing can collectively address power imbalances in the media

landscape and work towards a more inclusive and democratic media environment. These recommendations aim to promote a critical understanding of power dynamics in the media, empower individuals to challenge dominant narratives, and contribute to the creation of a more inclusive and equitable media environment.

However, as the study of power and knowledge within media systems evolves, Michel Foucault's theoretical framework continues to provide knowledge and avenues for exploration. By examining power, knowledge, and resistance, Foucault's ideas offer researchers a robust framework for understanding the complexities of media landscapes. In light of this, several open questions and areas for future studies emerge: firstly, how can Foucault's ideas on power/knowledge regimes and truth regimes be applied to analyze the influence of media conglomerates and corporate interests in shaping public discourse?; how can Foucault's perspective on power and knowledge contribute to the development of more inclusive and equitable media environments, particularly in terms of representation, diversity, and access?; and, lastly, how do alternative and community media platforms challenge dominant power structures within the media landscape, and what strategies can be employed to support and amplify their voices?

Suggestions for Future Studies

Future research must move decisively beyond descriptive applications of Foucault and undertake rigorous empirical investigations into how power/knowledge is materially organized within Ghana's media system. Conceptual invocations of "regimes of truth" are insufficient unless grounded in institutional analysis. Subsequent studies should therefore conduct systematic examinations of ownership structures, advertising dependencies, political affiliations, newsroom hierarchies, and regulatory frameworks to determine how these structures shape what counts as legitimate knowledge. Such work would connect Foucault's analytics of discipline and truth production to observable media practices and decision-making processes. Future scholarship should also subject "resistance" to empirical scrutiny. Claims that alternative or community media challenge dominant narratives require careful documentation of reach, sustainability, audience trust, funding models, and vulnerability to co-optation. Research must examine whether these platforms disrupt prevailing truth regimes or become absorbed into existing political and commercial logics. Longitudinal case studies following specific controversies such as elections, public health crises, protest movements would enable scholars to trace how dominant frames consolidate authority, how counter-discourses emerge, and under what conditions they gain institutional traction.

There is also a pressing need to interrogate platform governance as a contemporary disciplinary apparatus. Algorithmic visibility, content moderation, verification systems, and monetization rules structure what becomes sayable and knowable in digital environments. Future research should combine policy analysis, digital trace data, and interviews with platform actors to examine how these technical systems shape discourse and constrain

resistance. This would extend Foucauldian analysis into the infrastructural dimensions of media power.

Moreover, audience agency must be examined with methodological precision. Assertions that audiences resist dominant narratives should be supported through mixed-method designs that analyze interpretive practices, media repertoires, and differential access to alternative knowledge sources across class, gender, region, and education. Such research can clarify whether resistance produces durable shifts in discourse or remains episodic and fragmented. Finally, future studies should situate Foucauldian analysis within comparative and interdisciplinary frameworks. Engaging sociological theories of power, political economy of media, and African media scholarship would strengthen theoretical robustness and address critiques that Foucauldian work sometimes neglects structural economic dimensions. A research agenda that integrates institutional analysis, discourse analysis, digital infrastructure studies, and audience research would produce a more exact account of how power/knowledge circulates, stabilizes, and is contested within Ghana's evolving media ecology.

Funding: This research received no external funding

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Author Bio note

Ofori-Birikorang Ama Boatemaa- ao802221@ohio.edu

Ama Boatemaa Ofori-Birikorang is a doctoral student at the E.W Scripps College of Communication majoring in Media Arts & Studies. Originally from Ghana, Ama's academic journey began with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Political Science and French, which ignited her interest in issues related to power structures, decision making and social change.

After her bachelor's degree, she worked as a gender and development coordinator at the Center for Media and Development Communication for a year. Center for Media and Development Communication (CMDCC) is a non-governmental organization in Ghana that seeks to create awareness on issues regarding gender and minorities mainstreaming. As a gender and development coordinator, Ama was in-charge of developing programs and workshop for women and children empowerment within rural communities and wrote proposals to seek funding for initiatives.

References

Allen, A. (2009). Discourse, power, and subjectivation: The Foucault/Habermas debate reconsidered. *The Philosophical Forum*, 40(1), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9191.2008.00314.x>

Allen, A. (2017). Power/knowledge/resistance. *The Routledge Handbook of Epistemic Injustice*, 187–194. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315212043-18>

Atton, C. (2002). *Alternative media*. Sage.

Baaz, M., et al., (2017a). Defining and analyzing “resistance”. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 41 (3), 137–153. doi:10.1177/0304375417700170.

Balan, S. (2010). M. Foucault’s view on power relations. *Cogito: Multidisciplinary Res. J.*, 2, 193.

Bevir, M. (1999). Foucault, power, and Institutions. *Political Studies*, 47(2), 345–359. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.00204>

Brighenti, A. M. (2011). Power, subtraction, and social transformation: Canetti and Foucault on the notion of resistance. *Distinktion: Journal of Social Theory*, 12(1), 57–78. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1600910X.2011.549331>

Canetti, E. (1973). *Crowds and power*. New York: Seabury Press.

Chang H. C. H., Richardson A, Ferrara E. (2022) #JusticeforGeorgeFloyd: How Instagram facilitated the 2020 Black Lives Matter protests. *PLOS ONE* 17(12): e0277864. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0277864>

Couldry, N. (2000). *The place of media power: Pilgrims and witnesses of the media age*. Routledge.

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

Couzens, H. D. (1988). Foucault: Modern or postmodern? *After Foucault*, 12–41. <https://doi.org/10.36019/9780813566153-003>

Curran, J., Gurevitch, M., & Woollacott, J. (2005). The study of the media: Theoretical approaches. In *Culture, society, and the media* (pp. 6-25). Routledge.

Dews, P. (1984). Power and subjectivity in Foucault. *New Left Review*, 144(1), 72-95.

Downing, J. (2001). *Radical media: Rebellious communication and social movements*. Sage.

Downing, J. D. (2008). *Alternative media and the politics of resistance*. M. Pajnik (Ed.). Peace Inst.

Durkheim, É. (1995). *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fiske, J. (1987). *Television culture*. Routledge.

Foucault, M. & Gordon, C. (1980). *Michel Foucault: Power/Knowledge—Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972–1977*. New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1970). *The Order of Things*. London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge* (A. M. Sheridan Smith, Trans.). Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality, Volume 1: An introduction* (R. Hurley, Trans.). Pantheon Books.

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

Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. *Critical Inquiry*, 8(4), 777–795.

Foucault, M. (1998). *The History of Sexuality: The Will to Knowledge*, London, Penguin.

Foucault, M. (2010). *The Archaeology of Knowledge: And the Discourse on Language* (First Edition; A. Sheridan-Smith, Trans.). New York: Vintage

Foucault: power is everywhere: Understanding power for social change. Understanding power for social change | powercube.net | IDS at Sussex University | Understanding power for social change. (2010, March 8). <https://www.powercube.net/other-forms-of-power/foucault-power-is-everywhere/>

Gibson, J. J. (1977). The theory of affordances. *Hilldale, USA*, 1(2), 67-82.

Harcourt, B. E. (2011). *Radical thought from Marx, Nietzsche, and Freud, through Foucault, to the present: Comments on Steven Lukes's in defense of False Consciousness*. University of Chicago Legal Forum. University of Chicago.

Harrison, P. R. (1992). Michel Foucault. In P. Beilharz (Ed.), *Social Theory: A Guide to Central Thinkers*. St Leonards, NSW: Allen and Unwin.

Haugaard, M. (2022). Foucault and Power: A Critique and Retheorization. *Critical Review*, 34(3–4), 341–371. <https://doi-org.proxy.library.ohio.edu/10.1080/08913811.2022.2133803>

Heller, K. J. (1996). Power, subjectification, and resistance in Foucault. *SubStance*, 25(1), 78. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3685230>

Hobbs, M. (2008, December). On discourse and representation: Reflections on Michel Foucault's contribution to the study of the mass media. In annual conference of the Australian Sociological Association, University of Melbourne.

Isenberg, B. (1991). Habermas on Foucault Critical Remarks. *Acta Sociologica*,34(4), 299–308. doi:10.1177/000169939103400404

Kellner, D. (1995). *Media culture: Cultural studies, identity and politics between the modern and the postmodern*. Routledge.

Kenix, L. J. (2011). *Alternative and Mainstream Media. The converging spectrum* (p. 224). Bloomsbury Academic, 224, <https://doi.org/10.5040/9781849665421>

Lekssays, A. (2017, May 5). Foucault and Habermas Debate on Power and Media. Medium. <https://medium.com/@ahmedlekssays/foucault-and-habermas-debate-on-power-and-media-c3e9871b3661>

Manokha, I. (2009). Foucault's concept of power and the global discourse of human rights. *Global Society*, 23(4), 429–452. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600820903198792>

Maqbool, A. (2020, July 9). Black lives matter: From Social Media Post to Global Movement. BBC News. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-53273381>

McCoy, T. S. (1988). Hegemony, power, media: Foucault and cultural studies. *Comm*, 14(3), 71–90. <https://doi.org/10.1515/comm.1988.14.3.71>

Medina, J. (2011). Toward a Foucaultian epistemology of resistance: Counter-memory, epistemic friction, and guerrilla pluralism. *Foucault Studies*, 9–35. <https://doi.org/10.22439/fs.v0i12.3335>

Michael, M., & Still, A. (1992). A resource for resistance: Power-knowledge and affordance. *Theory and Society*, 21(6), 869–888. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00992815>

Myers, M. (2011). *Voices from villages: Community radio in the developing world*. Center for International Media Assistance, 3, 271-292.

Naraghi, A. R. (2012). *Foucault's Conception of Power and Resistance*.

Panneerselvam, S. (2000). A Critique of Foucault's Power And Knowledge. *Indian Philosophical Quarterly* ,1/2(27), 13–28. Retrieved from <https://philpapers.org/rec/PANACO-2>.

Panreck, H. (2023, October 11). Pro-Palestinian Student Group Plans National "day of resistance," calls for "mass mobilization." Fox News. <https://www.foxnews.com/media/pro-palestinian-student-chapter-plans-day-resistance-calls-mass-mobilization>

Poorghorban, Y. (2023). On Michel Foucault: Power/Knowledge, Discourse, and Subjectivity. *OKARA: Jurnal Bahasa dan Sastra*, 17(2), 318-328. <https://doi.org/10.19105/ojbs.v17i2.9749>

PoReSo (The research group Power, Resistance and Social Change) (2020) Challenges to knowledge-making: the intricate interrelation of knowledge and resistance, *Journal of Political Power*, 13:2, 169-178, DOI: 10.1080/2158379X.2020.1764795

Roos, J. (2014, May 27). Jerome Roos, December 2011, "Foucault and the revolutionary self-castration of the Left." red & black writings. <https://redblackwritings.wordpress.com/2014/05/14/jerome-roos-december-2011-foucault-and-the-revolutionary-self-castration-of-the-left/>

Thorpe, S. (2017, May 11). In Defence of Foucault: The Incessancy of Resistance. Critical Legal Thinking. <https://criticallegalthinking.com/2012/02/07/in-defence-of-foucault-the-incessancy-of-resistance/>

Zeeshan, M. S. (n.d.). Politics of Media Representation, Foucault's Discourse & Usefulness in Study of Representation.

Our Affiliate Partners



Philippine Association of
Research Practitioners,
Educators and Statistical
Users, Inc.



Department of Sculpture
Technology, Takoradi
Technical University,
Ghana



Indonesia Scholar
Research & Publishing,
Indonesia



CHCALIE, Pangasinan
State University,
Philippines



World Federation of
Zervas Art Clubs, Greece



Club for UNESCO Arts and
Letters in Achaia, Greece



Department of
Educational Innovations in
Science & Technology,
KNUST, Ghana



Department of Indigenous
Art & Technology, KNUST,
Ghana