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Chapter One
Scope of study and a day in the life of Jane Doe

In this chapter I first set out the adopted definitions of social media and UGC (ie, user-generated content), along with the inclusions of certain types of UGC within the scope of this book. I then explain why I have chosen to confine the discussion in the book to content-generative activities occurring on certain categories of social media platforms.

At the end of this chapter I describe a day in the life of Jane Doe, a hypothetical user of social media. Together with other users, she engages in content-generative activities across a few social media platforms, including those surveyed in this book. These activities constitute a case study, which assist in anchoring the discussions in the later chapters of the book.

I. Defining social media and user-generated content

Among the characterisations of social media discussed earlier, social media has been defined specifically to mean ‘a group of internet-based applications that build on the ideological and technological foundations of web 2.0, and that allow the creation and exchange of UGC’. The term ‘social media’ is distinct from the related concepts of web 2.0 and UGC. While web 2.0 refers collectively to the ‘architecture of participation’ or the technological platforms for the evolution of social media, UGC describes instead the various forms of content that are created and shared with the public by users of social media services. Due to the characteristics embodied by web 2.0 involving the development of internet-based applications designed to be user-centric and to facilitate collaboration
among users in the creation and modification of content, there is an increased generation of both original and derivative UGC online.\(^5\)

UGC is referred to under a few labels. The Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has defined ‘user-created content’ in a 2007 study as: (i) content ‘made publicly available over the internet’; (ii) content which reflects a ‘certain amount of creative effort’; and (iii) content which is ‘created outside of professional routines and practices’.\(^6\) This OECD definition of ‘user-created content’ has been frequently cited in other research.\(^7\)

Another term, ‘amateur creative digital content’ (ACDC),\(^8\) similarly refers to UGC. The word ‘creative’ in ACDC conveys the sense that the content on social media platforms is derived from the creative labour of amateurs.\(^9\) This arguably mirrors the substance of the second limb of the OECD definition. On the other hand, the word ‘amateur’ in ACDC implies both the positive sense of a commitment to a pastime and the negative sense of a lack of skill or knowledge.\(^10\) The quality of ‘non-professionalism’ conveyed by the latter brings to mind the substance of the third limb of the OECD definition.

Ultimately, the existence of these alternative labels for UGC is of little significance – they are discussed mainly to clarify the type of content with which this book is concerned. For my purpose in the book, the term UGC will be employed over other substitute terms including ‘user-created content’ or ACDC. To substantiate the meaning given to UGC further, I note that there is also a definition of UGC as content possessing ‘an element of either originality, transformativity or a combination of the two’.\(^11\) This definition seems to complement the OECD definition – this is because content possessing either originality or resulting from transformative uses, or indeed encompassing both qualities, will also reflect an adequate amount of creative effort to satisfy the second limb of the OECD definition. To develop further on its meaning, not all UGC comprises content originally authored by the relevant users. Instead, UGC can be produced from transformative uses. For instance, when one draws on myriad pieces of original content in remixing video clips (on a platform such as YouTube), or juxtaposes two or more different images to create mash-ups of photographs (on a platform such as Pinterest), UGC results from these transformative uses.

Given these broad definitions of UGC, it is appropriate to set out the types of UGC that are excluded from, and included within, this book’s scope. With reference to the first limb of the OECD definition, UGC refers to content that is publicly accessible and that is published in some context. This *publication* requirement excludes *bilateral* messages such as emails.\(^12\)
With reference to the second limb of the OECD definition, UGC refers to new or adapted content embodying creative effort. As UGC that is a by-product of transformation raises concerns of copyright infringement by users, therefore, I am concerned with the activities resulting in adapted content, in relation to my consideration of users’ compliance with copyright laws when undertaking these activities. UGC that is original content involving no adaptation, derivation or copying on the part of a user is also within the book’s purview, mainly in relation to addressing first if such UGC is copyright protected, before the question of infringement follows.

At the same time, it has been suggested that UGC should not refer to content that has been appropriated wholesale from another source. For instance, an episode of a television show copied by a user and shared on a content platform such as YouTube is not classified as UGC. Nonetheless, such content taken wholesale will be included within this book’s scope, as infringement issues clearly arise for consideration where content is uploaded without the permission of copyright holders.

With reference to the third limb of the OECD definition, UGC refers to content created outside of professional practices, and that does not have a commercial market. At the initial stages of the participative web, UGC was produced with social incentives in mind, such as the desire for self-expression and status, rather than with the expectation of remuneration. This last characteristic of non-commercialism is increasingly unreliable as an identifying element of UGC, as amateur users often evolve into professionals after an initial phase of non-commercial activity. Indeed, commercial interests can co-exist with altruistic motivations behind the production of content on social media.

Moreover, the point of time when commercial motivations arise in an amateur creator requires a subjective enquiry into his or her intention, which may not be ascertainable. In applying this qualifier in the third limb, more allowance for deviation should be tolerated. If the requirement for absence of commercial motivation is applied restrictively, it can effectively exclude a substantially large amount of UGC from this book’s scope. The creation of content beyond a professional routine nevertheless remains a useful concept in general to distinguish UGC from content conventionally produced by commercial entities. Notwithstanding this, given the limitations of the third limb of the OECD definition, it should not be rigidly applied in determining if any content in question is UGC.
In the following section, I will explain – with reference to existing classifications of UGC and social media – why I have chosen to look at the content-generative activities occurring across certain categories of social media platforms.

II. Choice of social media platforms

It is important to identify both the type of UGC with which the book is concerned and the context in which the UGC is created, modified and disseminated, in order to decide which social media platforms to survey for the book. This is because the production of different types of UGC is linked to the specific UGC distribution platforms.21

In this respect I have decided to confine the book to evaluating the activities which generate what Troscrow et al identify as ‘creative content’22 or ‘individual textual, audio, image, video and multimedia productions that are distributed online through software platforms including blogs and podcast repositories’. These platforms include, among others, Facebook, Pinterest, Twitter, YouTube (four out of five social media platforms surveyed for this book), Tumblr and Flickr, as well as citizen journalism sites.23

At the same time I have drawn on Kaplan and Haenlein’s classification of social media24 to focus on four specific categories of social media.25 These categories are: collaborative projects; blogs; content communities; and social networking sites.26 Because virtual game and social worlds raise special issues, I have excluded the last two categories of Kaplan and Heinlein’s classification from consideration.27 Given the chosen focus of the book, I will investigate in particular the application of copyright laws to the content-generative activities, and explore how these align with the terms of service and the technological features, across selected social media platforms from the four categories. I have selected at least one platform28 from each of these four categories for survey in the book.

III. A day in the life of Jane

It is timely to give examples of how content can be created, modified and shared on multiple social media platforms by a hypothetical user named Jane Doe, along with other users, all in a single day. In this case study my focus on content-generative activities resulting in ‘creative content’ on four categories of social media informs my choice of the social
media platforms Jane and other users generate content on. The platforms surveyed for the purpose of the book and henceforth included as platforms used under the case study will include: the social networking site Facebook; the content communities Pinterest and YouTube; the blog Twitter; and the collaborative project Wikipedia. With the case study modelled after the usual content-generative activities occurring on social media, I can then consider how the similar activities of Jane and the other users are practically regulated by copyright laws, the terms of service and the technological features in the subsequent chapters of the book. I have also made references in the case study to social media platforms not surveyed in the book, such as the blog WordPress. Such references are useful in illustrating the methodical way in which the regulatory factors on another social media platform outside the book’s scope can be considered.

Jane wakes up one morning to a ‘bespoke’ alarm call from an application on her mobile device. Her friend Elly has recommended to her a music video clip of her favourite singer uploaded by the singer’s managers on YouTube, and Jane has chosen to have the video clip played, through the application, as her alarm this morning. She is pleasantly surprised with her friend’s good choice, opens her Pinterest account while still in bed and ‘pins’ the video on her pin-board named ‘My Favourite Things’, with the comment ‘Use as your wake-up call!’ This addition on her pin-board is viewed by over two hundred of her ‘followers’ in their ‘home feeds’, comprising both close friends and strangers, all of whom have decided to ‘follow’ Jane’s interests on Pinterest.

Jane jumps out of bed and promptly dresses for work. Her workplace is an hour’s ride from her home, but this does not concern her. There are just so many ways she can entertain herself on the train, as she has done every single weekday morning. She whips out her mobile phone and logs into her Facebook account to check what her friends are up to. Through her ‘news feed’ she gets to view the posts of others within her network. One of her friends, Evangeline, wrote a commentary about income inequality – Jane reads it, and could not help agreeing more, so much so that she is inspired to share the post with others. To re-post this commentary of Evangeline’s on her own ‘Timeline’, there are a few options available to Jane. She can choose either to do a manual selection of the text, followed by a ‘copy and paste’, or she can choose more conveniently to click the ‘Share’ option tab positioned right under her friend’s commentary. In the first scenario, it may not be clear to a third party reading the post from Jane’s ‘Timeline’ that Evangeline is the original author, unless Jane makes the effort to attribute Evangeline as the author, perhaps by incorporating
a short note to that effect. In the latter scenario, if Jane chooses to use the ‘Share’ option, the source of the content, being Evangeline, will be clearly reflected in the post on Jane’s ‘Timeline’.

What if Jane decided to include her views and to incorporate them as part of the post, just above or below the original commentary written by Evangeline? In this case, Jane’s comment is not distinguishable from Evangeline’s original commentary, at least to readers of such post. What if these views of Jane’s are substantive in quantum and quality, and not mere one-liner comments to Evangeline’s original post? Alternatively Jane may simply decide to insert her views as a ‘comment’ on Facebook, placed under the original post from Evangeline. Running through these options in her head, Jane decides instead to weave her views into Evangeline’s commentary, such that the commentary as a whole puts forward a coherent argument. Unfortunately, the content contributed by Evangeline can no longer be separately identified in Jane’s commentary. Nevertheless, Jane posts this commentary, which incorporates her comments to Evangeline’s original commentary, on her Facebook ‘Timeline’.

If Jane does not expressly attribute Evangeline as the original author of the content that Jane drew from in her commentary, Evangeline’s identity will be obscured. Is Jane’s commentary copyright protected? What are Evangeline’s rights in relation to preventing Jane’s use in this instance? Does Facebook, through its terms of service and technological features, encourage Jane and other users to engage in content-generative activities that respect the copyrights of other users such as Evangeline, or is one witnessing the contrary instead?

Still logged into her Facebook account, Jane glances at her watch and realises that she has half an hour to go before she arrives at her destination. Her Twitter account runs in the background and she decides to take this time to check her ‘Twitter feed’. She notes, to her delight, that her favourite celebrity blogger Small-Steps just ‘tweeted’ ‘New Post – Welcoming a New Member into our Family’. A link to this latest post on Small-Steps’ WordPress site has been included within the ‘tweet’. Jane immediately clicks on this link, and at the top of Small-Steps’ blog post, she spots a photograph of Small-Steps’ newborn baby, just delivered yesterday evening at a local hospital.

A brilliant idea comes to Jane’s mind, and she immediately searches for other photographs of newborn babies on the pin-boards of other Pinterest users using the key search term ‘newborn’. To her delight, lots of results show up on this search. Jane carefully selects the photographs that appeal to her, crops some of them and forms a collage with the selected images. In creating this collage, Jane uses the aid of some photo-editing tools...
applications on her mobile phone. She is proud of this collage and decides to title it ‘Remedy for an Aging Population’ before sharing the collage on her pin-board on Pinterest. She is given the option, on Pinterest’s interface, as to whether she wants to simultaneously share the ‘pin’ on Facebook. Feeling it a waste not to share it, she decides to do so, and her collage appears accordingly on her Facebook ‘Timeline’. She also shares the collage on Twitter, by incorporating the link to her pin-board in a ‘tweet’. At the same time Jane decides to log into her WordPress account, so that she can share her collage with the readers of her blog and express at greater length the thoughts she had while creating the collage.

When Jane finally reaches work, a group of her colleagues approaches her and tell her that they agree very much with her latest commentary on income inequality on Facebook – in fact, they think that her commentary makes a very original and credible argument. One of her colleagues Zee has strong convictions in sharing information for public benefit and decides unilaterally to add this information on ‘income inequality’ posted by Jane on her ‘Timeline’ to the content page on ‘income inequality’ on Wikipedia. Zee holds the opinion that listing the source of the new information he contributed (ie, being a user’s Facebook ‘Timeline’) may defeat the credibility of the information, and he decides against attributing Jane as the source of the comment. Jane is not aware of this, nor that subsequent to Zee’s sharing of her commentary, other content contributors to Wikipedia will eventually develop on Jane’s original expression of her idea. Due to Zee’s contribution of Jane’s commentary, the content page on ‘income inequality’ on Wikipedia is modified into something quite different from what it once was.

On returning home after a hard day at work, Jane winds down by watching video clips on YouTube. Feeling her creative juices churning again, she decides to share a new video clip on YouTube, as well as on the ‘Timeline’ of her Facebook page, created by way of ‘vidding’, so that her final clip comprises extracted footages from different video clips available on YouTube. This video clip she creates incorporates scenes shared by the producers of her favourite television series, ‘Making Good’, with scenes from other random video clips shared of the same television series, albeit not uploaded by the producers nor with their consent. This video clip is intended to reflect Jane’s interpretation and thoughts of how a character, by whom she is particularly intrigued, develops in the series. Later that evening Cheryl – someone Jane does not know – chances on Jane’s video clip on YouTube. She decides to take screen captures of a few images from the clip and to display these screenshots as thumbnail images on her website, for aesthetic purposes and to tell a different story.
With reference to the events above, what are Jane’s rights against Zee and Cheryl, in relation to her commentary and her video clip respectively, under copyright laws? What are the rights of the producers of the television series ‘Making Good’ against Jane? How can social media platforms such as Facebook, Wikipedia and YouTube influence Jane, Zee and Cheryl’s compliance with copyright laws, when they generate content on these platforms?

Before going to sleep that night, Jane thinks of her use of multiple social media platforms and the comments that she has received – from friends, colleagues, and readers whom she does not personally know – for the content she has shared on Facebook, Pinterest, Twitter, WordPress and YouTube. She is grateful that through technology she can widen her reach to so many different audiences. She does not anticipate that, in the next couple of weeks, the collage she shared on Pinterest, Facebook and Twitter, while on her way to work that morning, will spread like wildfire on social media, and that the original photographs included in the collage will be recognised by all the mothers of the newborns featured. Some of the photographs have been cropped, while others, remaining un-cropped, have been photo-edited such that the edited photographs can be differentiated from the originals.

Quite a few avid social media users adopt Jane’s style of creating this collage. Several selectively crop a portion of her collage to create their own versions for dissemination on Pinterest, Facebook and Twitter. Meanwhile Jane’s collage also catches the attention of a magazine editor, Jasper. He considers using it on the cover page for his magazine’s next issue, since its feature article will be on the falling birth rates in developed countries.

Further questions arise from these events. What are the rights of the users who own the copyrights to the original photographs against Jane? Will other users who have adapted and disseminated Jane’s collage fall foul of copyright laws? What are the rights of Jane, as well as of the users who own the copyrights to the original photographs, against Jasper, if he uses Jane’s collage as described? Is an application of the terms of service and the technological features on platforms such as Pinterest, Facebook and Twitter consistent with an application of copyright laws to the content-generative activities of Jane and other users?

There could be more questions raised than there are answers for them. Indeed, there are endless possibilities for the content-generative activities that can occur on social media and their consequential implications under copyright laws. Within this book’s limitations, my focus on the activities described in the case study will make more tangible the ways in which copyright laws, the terms of service and the technological features regulate the content-generative behaviours of social media users.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of social media platform</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Description of main activities on social media platform</th>
<th>Formats and descriptions of content</th>
<th>Content-generative activities that may attract copyright liabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Collaborative Projects | Wikis | To add, delete and/or modify content | Text: Original works written or adapted from other works  
Photographs or images: Photographs or images taken, modified and/or posted  
Music and audio: Music and audio files recorded, edited and/or posted  
Videos: Video files recorded, edited and/or posted, such video files being remixes of existing content, original home-made content or a combination of the two | Using, in part, the original work of another person to contribute to the content on wikis  
Using, in part, the derivative or transformative work of another person (not being the original author) to contribute to the content on wikis |

(continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of social media platform</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Description of main activities on social media platform</th>
<th>Formats and descriptions of content</th>
<th>Content-generative activities that may attract copyright liabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blogs</td>
<td>Single-Author or Multi-Author Blogs: Blogger, WordPress, LiveJournal</td>
<td>To create entries at desired intervals on any topic, for the purpose of providing commentaries on various subjects, to serve as online diaries and/or to advertise brands online</td>
<td>All of the above pertaining to Collaborative Projects apply here</td>
<td>All of the above pertaining to Collaborative Projects apply here, but in respect of contributing to the content on blogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To allow for interactivity with readers, who are in most instances allowed to leave comments and respond to other readers via widgets</td>
<td></td>
<td>Commenting on, criticising or targeting the original work of another person for ridicule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Micro-blogs: Tumblr, Twitter</td>
<td>Same as above, but entries of digital content are smaller</td>
<td>All of the above pertaining to Collaborative Projects apply here</td>
<td>Using, in part, the original work of another person to comment on something else, although the secondary work retains its underlying relevance to the original work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To allow for more interactivity with readers, who are allowed to re-post the entries to demonstrate consensus</td>
<td></td>
<td>Re-contextualising the original work without modification, but changing the meaning of the original work, so that the secondary work is perceived differently by others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Changing the purpose of the original work within an expressive context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1 (Cont.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of social media platform</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Description of main activities on social media platform</th>
<th>Formats and descriptions of content-generative activities that may attract copyright liabilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Content Communities</td>
<td>YouTube</td>
<td>To upload and/or view content</td>
<td>All of the above pertaining to Collaborative Projects apply here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vimeo</td>
<td>To allow for interactivity, since viewers are allowed to leave comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IMDB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rotten Tomatoes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pinterest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HubPages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Etsy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Networking Sites</td>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>All of the above pertaining to blogs and Content Communities apply here</td>
<td>All of the above pertaining to Collaborative Projects apply here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LinkedIn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Google Plus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What is written on Collaborative Projects applies only to a limited extent (particularly in respect of deleting or modifying content, other than by way of giving comments to an original post), mainly due to the absence of the common goal to produce content with combined effort</td>
<td>All of the above pertaining to Single-Author or Multi-Author Blogs apply here</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These categories of uses are the types of transformative uses for which the fair use doctrine in the US arises for consideration. See David Tan, ‘The Transformative Use Doctrine and Fair Dealing in Singapore’ (2012) 24 Singapore Academy of Law Journal 832, 846–8. A fifth category was recognised in David Tan, ‘The Lost Language of the First Amendment in Copyright Fair Use: Leval’s “Transformative Use” Doctrine Twenty-Five Years On’ (2016) 26 Fordham Intellectual Property, Media & Entertainment Law Journal 311, 324–5. This fifth category relates to changing the purpose of the original work within a technological context (for example, time-shifting for later viewing) and is therefore not relevant for consideration in respect of the content-generative activities occurring on social media.
IV. Conclusion

Table 1.1 above lists the content-generative activities that occur on social media platforms such as collaborative projects, blogs, content communities and social networking sites. It also articulates an overview of the formats of content that is generated and the activities that potentially attract copyright liabilities. The platforms surveyed in this book are highlighted in bold.

With the defined focus of this chapter in mind, I will discuss, in the next chapter, copyright’s regulation of the content-generative behaviours of social media users, especially the challenges posed by the copyright laws of the US, the UK and Australia. I will also consider the implications of the strict application of copyright laws to the content-generative activities of Jane and the other users in the case study.

Notes
1. See, for example, Mayfield, A. 2008; DeNardis, L. and Hackl, W.M. 2015; Hogan, B. and Quan-Haase, A. 2010.
10. Hunter, D. et al. 2013. Alternatively this could mean that the pastime or activity is not done for remuneration alone.
14. See, for example, Gervais, D. 2009, 858.
17. See, for example, Wunsch-Vincent, S. and Vickery, G. 2007.
22. I have referred to one classification of user-generated content (UGC), proposing that there are three principal intersecting and overarching models of content creation and distribution; see Samuel E. Troscow et al., Mobilizing User-Generated Content for Canada’s Advantage (1 December 2010) Faculty of Information and Media Studies at the University of Western Ontario <ir.lib.uwo.ca/fimspub/21/>. The classification was borne out of an earlier study conducted by a group of researchers, most of whom co-authored the subsequent article proposing this classification; see McKenzie, P.J. et al. 2012. The reference made to creative content (ie, content under the first model) under this classification is general; it may not always include content that meets the requisite modicum of creativity and is hence copyright-protectable. Under the second model, there are small-scale tools that are software applications or modifications written to provide access to pre-existing data sets, or to augment software and hardware platforms. These tools can include, among others, user-created applications for mobile devices or for social media platforms such as Facebook, modifications and virtual objects created by users of virtual social worlds (for instance, Second Life) or virtual game worlds (for instance, World of Warcraft). Under the third model there is collaborative content, which refers to content collaboratively produced and distributed by individuals or companies. This content includes, among others, content on wikis such as Wikipedia and open-source software such as the Mozilla Firefox web browser. These categories are not mutually exclusive – for example, collaborative content, comprising individual and collective contributions, is typically also creative content (as is the case with content on Wikipedia).
24. Kaplan, A.M. and Haenlein, M. 2010, 59–61. The classification relies on a set of theories in the dual fields of media research and social processes. While the former field is defined by properties such as social presence and media richness, the latter field is defined by properties such as self-presentation and self-disclosure. In relation to the first field – the media dimension in the term ‘social media’ – the element of social presence is dependent on the intimacy and immediacy of the medium of communication, while the concept of media richness is premised on the assumption that the goal of communicating to another is the reduction of ambiguity. See Richard L. Daft and Robert H. Lengel, ‘Organisational Information Requirements, Media Richness and Structural Design’ (1986) 32(5) Management Science 554. In relation to the second field – the social-related component of the term ‘social media’ – presentation of the self by an individual comes with the desire to control others’ impressions of him or her. See Erving Goffman, The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life (Doubleday Anchor Books, 1959); see also John Short et al, Social Psychology of Telecommunications (John Wiley & Sons, 1976). Just as is the case with UGC, the categories are not mutually exclusive – for example, a social networking platform such as Facebook has characteristics associated with content communities. A Facebook user can not only establish connections with other users, but he or she can also share content in various formats with such other users.
26. Collaborative projects enable the concurrent creation of content by multiple users, and include wikis as well as social bookmarking applications. Blogs are platforms that display posts typically in reverse chronological order; they can include personal journals as well as collations of information in specific content areas of interest. Content communities allow primarily for the sharing of media content between users. Social networking sites allow users primarily to
establish social networks online. Virtual game and social worlds are online communities that simulate real life by enabling users to appear in the form of personalised avatars to interact with one another; see Kaplan, A.M. and Haenlein, M. 2010. Virtual game and social worlds are excluded from consideration as the content generated in these environments constitutes small-scale tools. On the other hand, the content on platforms hosting collaborating projects is both collaborative and creative.


28. Pinterest and YouTube are both content communities selected for the survey. This choice has been made so that a wider range of activities can be included in the case study and considered in this book. However, most formats of content can be shared on both platforms – Pinterest remains primarily an image-sharing platform and YouTube a platform to share video clips.

29. Facebook, Facebook <https://www.facebook.com>. Users of Facebook typically start using the service by creating profiles with their personal information and develop this further by establishing connections with others within the network. Users can communicate with ‘friends’ or other users – ie, those with whom the aforementioned users have not established virtual friendships – by sending private messages, utilising a chat feature or posting messages on the ‘timelines’ of these other ‘friends’ or users. The visibility of posts on the ‘timelines’ of Facebook users, whether to the public, ‘friends’ of such users or only to the users themselves, is dependent on the privacy settings of these Facebook users. As with most other social networking sites, Facebook allows users to ‘post’ photographs, audio files, video files and comments to the ‘posts’ or ‘status updates’ of other users.

30. See Wikipedia, Pinterest <en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pinterest>. See also Pinterest, pinterest.com <www.pinterest.com>. Pinterest allows for the sharing of photographs, audio and video files on pin-boards. Users can also comment on other users’ ‘pins’, as well as choose to re-share these ‘pins’ on Facebook and Twitter.

31. YouTube, YouTube <https://www.youtube.com>. On YouTube video files can be uploaded, viewed and shared (including on other social media platforms a user is registered on, such as Facebook, Google Plus, Tumblr, Twitter, and so on). A user can also comment on the video files shared by others.

32. See Wikipedia, Twitter <en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Twitter>. See also Twitter, twitter.com <www.twitter.com>. On a micro-blog such as Twitter, the main constraint is on the number of characters that a ‘tweet’ can have. Although primarily text-based, the text in a message can include the link to content in alternative media formats on other social media platforms such as YouTube, Pinterest, and so on.

33. Wikipedia, Wikipedia <https://www.wikipedia.org/> . Content can be added, deleted or modified on most Wikipedia pages, except where such pages are protected and can only be edited by established registered users.

34. For instance, the application Easy Alarm YouTube that allows users to play YouTube video clips as their clock alarms. This can be purchased from Google Play, Easy Alarm YouTube <https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=com.cimleah.easyalarm&hl=en>.

35. People typically ‘follow’ other users either due to associations in real life or due to similar interests.

36. A pseudonym used by the blogger.

37. ‘Vidding’ is the practice of creating video clips from the footage of one or more media sources. See, for example, Wikipedia, Vidding <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vidding>.