

2009

## Generative audiences and social media

David Tham  
*Edith Cowan University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ecuworks>



Part of the [Communication Technology and New Media Commons](#)

---

Tham, D. (2009). Generative Audiences and Social Media. In Papandrea, F., & Armstrong, M. (Eds.) Record of the Communications Policy & Research Forum 2009, (pp. 216-235). Sydney, N.S.W.: Network Insight. Available [here](#)  
This Conference Proceeding is posted at Research Online.  
<https://ro.ecu.edu.au/ecuworks/404>

# GENERATIVE AUDIENCES AND SOCIAL MEDIA

---

DAVID CHRISTOPHER THAM

(Refereed)

Edith Cowan University  
Perth, Western Australia

## ABSTRACT

The influence of traditional mass media institutions is being challenged by an unprecedented level of audience participation and co-creation in online media production, which has blurred the lines between consumer and producer, audience and public. There are signs suggesting that this convergence has permeated into traditional market areas such as the tourism industry and the music industry respectively. Internet-based social media tools like blogs, podcasts, online video and social network websites, have given voice to the opinions of millions of individual consumers worldwide. And while traditional mass media (namely television, radio and print) continue to be central to the dissemination of (mainstream) information, these traditional channels are increasingly being influenced by those online conversations taking place in the social media.

This working paper is based on my ongoing doctoral research on the same topic and emphasises the need for a multidimensional approach to understanding the social media phenomenon. This paper postulates that ‘generative audiences’ are behind this convergence and contends that generative audiences have given rise to newer approaches to marketing and the engagement of audiences using social media network sites that are characterised by conversation and community. This paper discusses the generative phenomenon whereby individuals and organisations today are able to use those social media network sites to extend their sphere of influence to engage and/re-engage successive generations of audiences.

## Introduction

This conference paper discusses ‘audience generativity’ in relation to ‘social media’ to emphasise the need for a multidimensional approach to understand the social media phenomenon — one that recognises important contingencies in the organisational context of ‘generative audiences’. The significance of this discussion is that this is a crucial transitional time, when contending powers and counter-powers seek to use social media to, in a sense, ‘mobilise’ audiences in order to influence the way people relate to the world of information around them (Balnaves, O’Regan, & Sternberg, 2002). The conference paper is a working paper which proposes a definition of audience generativity and delves into a quality of generative audiences which resemble generative ‘publics’. The paper seeks to explain how loosely connected groups of people coming together for a common, often collaborative, purpose through the social Internet are related to the classic notion of ‘the public sphere’ (Habermas, 1989).

The effect of that generativity as the personal computer (PC), the mobile phone and Internet technologies converge in social media, is also discussed. In the context of this media convergence, this paper postulates that ‘generative audiences’ are characterised by their ability to represent emerging technology-mediated word-of-mouth advocacy behaviour that can be more easily harnessed by both private individuals and corporate organisations to generate richer narratives and communicative experiences about a product, service, or brand.

These richer narratives and experiences have an impact on public opinion, and they ultimately have a bearing on the sustainability of new marketing and public relations efforts in the cultural

industries,<sup>1</sup> particularly in the tourism and music industries respectively, where facilitated by social media and mobile wireless technology, audiences can come together to participate in a music concert or holiday group tour, and then disperse after the event, not unlike a modern-day ‘flash mob’ (Wasik, 2006).

Using a ‘family resemblance’ model derived from Ludwig Wittgenstein’s (1967) philosophical idea of the same name, this paper argues that media audiences (and publics) are ‘generative’ — producing and creating, and sustaining the products of that producing and creating, for subsequent generations of audiences (publics). In my treatment, the problem with which I begin with is not ‘what is social media?’ or ‘what are generative audiences or generative publics?’, but ‘what sort of concept is the media audience?’ Indeed, this paper takes the view that the root problem<sup>2</sup> of any philosophical or theoretical discussion on the relationship between media and audience is to explain the family resemblance between the use of certain discursive concepts and the conditions under which they are used (Wittgenstein, 1967). For example, social media resemble traditional mass media in some respects,<sup>3</sup> yet not all social media are social network sites (S. Boyd, 2007), even though ‘friending’<sup>4</sup> may be a common feature of most social media (D. M. Boyd, 2006; Fono & Raynes-Goldie, 2006). Likewise, generative audiences resemble ‘active audiences’<sup>5</sup> in most respects, yet not all active audiences, including successive generations of active audiences, are the same. Understanding these nuances is key to understanding the language of generativity in this context because the Internet has, in a sense, frustrated traditional analogies as a ‘meta-medium’<sup>6</sup> (Agre, 1998, p. 1).

The use of social networks is increasingly central to everyday life (Van Dijk, 2006, pp. 1–2). In August 2007, the Sydney Morning Herald reported that the social network site Facebook had been labelled ‘a \$5 billion waste of time’ in a report compiled by a commercial Internet filtering company. The report, published in one of Australia’s most established newspapers, estimated that the social network site may be costing Australian businesses \$5 billion a year because employees

<sup>1</sup> According to UNESCO, ‘cultural industries’ include textual, music, television, and film production and publishing, as well as crafts and design (‘Creative Industries’, 2007). Architecture, visual and performing arts, sport, advertising, and cultural tourism may be included as adding value to the content and generating values for individuals and societies (*Culture, Trade and Globalization*, 2003).

<sup>2</sup> David Hesmondhalgh’s The Cultural Industries (2002) typified another aspect of the problem with previous literature written from the cultural industries perspective about the impact of emerging technology and the Internet on the cultural industries when he referred to websites as ‘applications’ and the Google search engine as ‘Web 2.0’. In an attempt to explain Web 2.0 as a concept, Hesmondhalgh suggested that the concept applied to software such as ‘Linux, Apache and Perl’ and to applications such as ‘Google, eBay and Amazon’. However, as one anonymous reviewer pointed out on the Amazon website for the book: Linux is an operating system while PERL is a programming language, not software.

<sup>3</sup> ‘Social media’ has been used to refer to the tools that facilitate conversations through the mass media. It has also been used as a metaphor to describe the phenomenon involving the socialisation of information. Arguably, definitions of social media involving multimedia may be imprecise because the social aspect in social media does not necessarily have to be online to exist. (S. Boyd, 2007).

<sup>4</sup> In their examination of LiveJournal ‘friendship’, David Fono and Kate Raynes-Goldie (2006) described users’ understandings regarding public displays of connections and how the ‘Friending’ function could operate as a catalyst for social drama. In listing user motivations for ‘Friending’, Danah Boyd (2006) pointed out that ‘Friends’ on social network sites were not the same as ‘friends’ in the everyday sense of the word. Rather, ‘Friends’ provided context by offering users an *imagined* audience to guide behavioural norms.

<sup>5</sup> As the first generation to grow up with television became known as ‘baby boomers’, it became increasingly apparent to media theorists that audiences made choices about what they did when consuming media texts. Far from being a passive mass, audiences were made up of individuals who actively consumed such texts for different reasons and in different ways. Harold Lasswell (1948) suggested that media texts had the following functions for individuals and society: (i) surveillance; (ii) correlation; (iii) entertainment; and, (iv) cultural transmission. Within that perspective, the viewer came to be credited with a more active role, so that there was now the question of looking at what people did with the media, rather than what the media did to them (Halloran, 1970).

<sup>6</sup> ‘meta-medium’ refers to ‘a set of layered services that make it easy to construct new media with almost any properties one likes’ (Agre, 1998, p. 1).

were 'more likely to be whiling away the hours' on social networking than being productive (West, 2007). The Sydney Morning Herald article epitomised the growing concern among some Australian employers, traditional media business owners (facing competition from new media businesses), and commercial security analysts, about the use of online social network sites, especially in the workplace. It also typified one of ways by which a commercial or private corporation might exploit the publicity surrounding the significant popularity of social network sites like Facebook and Twitter, generating related publicity for their own corporate benefit.

While some employers have tried to restrict their employees' Internet use by blocking access to such sites, other employers have sought to establish 'protocols for using those social websites' (Bingemann, 2008; Bosses 'should embrace Facebook', 2008; Connolly, 2007; Palotie, 2008; West, 2007) because with the convergence of mobile wireless technologies with the PC, office computers are no longer the only means by which employees can access the Internet, and therefore social media (Phillips, 2006). Various authors (Anandarajan, Simmers, & Teo, 2006; Jenkins, 2006; Rheingold, 2002; Srivastava, 2005; Van Dijk, 2006) have discussed how the convergence of mobile wireless technologies with the Internet represent significant challenges to traditional gate-keeping control management practices, especially in the context of today's small mobile info-communication devices (such as the mobile phone, 'PDA', or 'smartphone'). The case signifies the contradicting corporate commercial interests and priorities represented by two kinds of mass consumption: media consumption, which has traditionally allowed businesses to reach mass target markets; and, the mass consumption of material goods and services mediated by the Internet and social network sites.

In The Generative Internet, Jonathan Zittrain (2006) argued that a change in consumer interests and priorities 'from generativity to stability' would compel undesirable responses from regulators and markets that if not addressed, 'could prove decisive in closing today's open computing environments' (p. 1975). Zittrain used the term 'generativity' to describe a quality of the Internet and of traditional Personal Computing (PC) architecture, and defined it as 'a system's capacity to produce unanticipated change through unfiltered contributions from broad and varied audiences' (Zittrain, 2008, p. 70). Zittrain modelled this definition of Internet and PC generativity on a simple hourglass architecture, whereby data would be funnelled by a sender through Internet Protocol (IP) or an operating system (OS), before it could be used on the other side by a receiver, such that 'anyone necessary in the middle can know the basics of who the data is from and where the data is going'<sup>7</sup> (Zittrain, 2008, p. 68). Zittrain applied generativity to the Internet and PC architecture, suggesting that the Internet, as technology, was the central generative force behind the phenomenon of social media. Zittrain (2006) explained how the development of the Internet impacted the way individuals interact with Internet media applications, particularly social media applications today. However, he did not discuss the effect each successive audience might have on subsequent generations of audiences because of that same interaction.

In the next section, this paper explains generativity as a human quality (in contrast to Zittrain's technological determinist's definition), and discusses the generative effect each successive audience has on subsequent generations of audiences' ability to shape the way new Internet and social media are used. As McAdams et al. (1998) pointed out; on the one hand, there are the popular writings about generativity; and, on the other hand, there is the need 'to articulate a clearer and more precise understanding of just what generativity is about' (p. 8).

---

<sup>7</sup> Zittrain's notion of 'anyone necessary in the middle' strongly resembles the notion of gatekeeping in communication studies.

## Defining generativity

The social construct of ‘generativity’ is arguably as old as that of the Internet and telecommunications respectively (Winston, 1998). In *Childhood And Society*, Erik Erikson (1950) used the term when he articulated a developmental model built on a list of eight ‘ego qualities’<sup>8</sup> by which an individual person might demonstrate that his/her ego ‘is strong enough to integrate the timetable of the organism with the structure of social institutions’ (p. 246). Generativity, Erikson explained:

... is primarily the concern in establishing who, through misfortune or because of special and genuine gifts in other directions, do not apply this drive to their own offspring. And indeed, the concept generativity is meant to include such more popular synonyms as *productivity* and *creativity*, which however, cannot replace it (p. 267).

John Kotre (n.d.) defined generativity as ‘*creativity* between the generations’ while Dan McAdams, Holly Hart and Shadd Maruna (1998) posited that generativity was about ‘creating and producing things, people, and outcomes that are aimed at benefiting, in some sense, the next generation, and even the next ... There are generative people, generative situations, and generative societies’ (McAdams et al., p. 7). Zittrain’s thesis on *The Generative Internet* (2006, 2008) implied that generativity can be applied to a technology setting. However, Zittrain’s definition of generativity differs from the definition put forward by this conference paper because Zittrain’s central thesis assumed that power resides mainly in the hands of regulators and markets and that the audiences are poorly equipped to produce counteractive responses.

This paper acknowledges that previous empirical studies on generativity (Erikson, 1950; Friedman, de St. Aubin, McAdams, & Kim, 2004; Kotre, 1984; McAdams et al., 1998; Stewart, Franz & Layton, 1988) were far less concerned about media audiences than they were about adult development; however, those studies foreground an intrinsic human desire to sustain the human relationships that result from producing and creating for subsequent generations of *audiences*.<sup>9</sup> Mapping Robert Hogan’s (1987) research on status and acceptance as fundamental social tasks faced by human beings to David Bakan’s (1966) earlier work on the dichotomy of agency and communion, McAdams et al. (1998) suggested that human audiences have evolved to be predisposed towards opportunities and incentives that are located in ‘agentic and communal domains’ and that these domains fuel the compelling desire behind generativity to ‘expand the self infinitely in time’ and ‘to care for that which one has created, to nurture and sustain it until it is ready to be on its own’ (p. 13). In institutional terms, this resembles the corporate organisation that reproduces itself through agency (namely, through the organisation’s brand and product) and then provides for its ‘offspring’ (e.g. its fans, community, mediated or networked audience, including the organisation’s own members/users) until that ‘offspring’ is able to ultimately do the same (McAdams et al., 1998). For example, in *PressThink: Ghost of Democracy in the Media Machine*, Jay Rosen (2006) inferred that ‘the people formerly known as the audience’ have become active participants in shaping both media content and public discourse. Rosen (2006) highlighted the possibility of a broader sense of ‘free press’ where almost anyone had the means to create a media presence online:

The people formerly known as the audience wish to inform media people of our existence, and of a shift in power that goes with the platform shift you’ve all heard about (p. 1).

Rosen’s (2006) blog statement was about a call to change the problematic way institutional media stakeholders and marketers have perceived their corporate/group relationship with an increasingly

<sup>8</sup> Erikson argued that these qualities emerged at key stages in a person’s psycho-development and that the period of generativity ‘encompassed the evolutionary development which has made man the teaching and instituting as well as the learning animal’ (p. 266).

<sup>9</sup> Plural emphasised.

technology-mediated audience: 'the audience' has often been perceived primarily as a singular passive recipient of media content even though an audience may comprise multiple individuals with different interests and opinions (Bennett & Entman, 2001; Bonney & Wilson, 1983; Gillmor, 2004; Rosen, 2006). More importantly, Rosen's statement exemplified how audiences, as offspring of traditional media institutions and markets, are now able to create their own social media presence.

Therefore, this paper defines generative audiences by their penchant to influence traditional Western media institutions and markets, altering the role of those media institutions and markets as social institutions by the active adoption and use of new media, particularly *online* social media (Gillmor, 2004; Rosen, 2006). In the next section, this paper argues that generative audiences' influential networking capability through the social media allows successive generative audiences to have the capacity to resist or defy traditional conformist media systems and conventions that operate on the Western private-ownership model.<sup>10</sup>

## Social media and participatory networking

Social media, as an umbrella term, attempts to define the various activities that integrate technology, social interaction, and the construction of words and visual imagery on a networked platform ('Social Media Definition', 2008). This interaction and the manner in which information is presented depend on varied perspectives and the building of shared meaning — elements important to the process and the mapping of space for consensus formation in a democracy — as people generate and share narratives and understandings. This is the significance of a study on audience generativity and why it is important to a discussion on new media audiences.

The sheer magnitude and pace of growth of social network sites has become such a global phenomenon that the rise of social media cannot be dismissed as a simple fad (Havenstein, 2008). Yet, a specific definition of social media is problematic because the social media construct is essentially an emergent and all-encompassing term ('Social Media Definition', 2008). This paper posits that the social media construct must be associated with generative use and participatory networking (as a movement), rather than be treated as a media object (a thing). Brian Solis (2007b), for example, remarked in a blog that until a stable definition of social media can be achieved, the only real way to understand social media is to *participate* in its use as an online tool:

Back in the day, social media was simply the ability to make online information available in a conversational format, such as bbs' and forums. It slowly evolved into providing the platforms and networks necessary to also put the power of media into the hands of the people, which transformed content consumers into content producers, i.e. blogs, wikis, podcasts, vlogs, social networks, etc. And now it continues to expand through bookmarking, crowd sourcing, video sharing, social widgets and plug-ins, among many others seen and yet to be seen. So to those critics of the term Social Media, we have to remember that it's about the people who understand what's going on, not the ones that are screaming about it. (Solis, 2007b).

David Bell and Peter Fader observed a certain evanescent quality<sup>11</sup> emerging from the use of social network sites and opined that the long-term success of those social network sites depended on their ability to retain the interest of their networking members ('MySpace, Facebook and Other Social Networking Sites', 2006). For example, the early adoption of social networking and micro-blogging site Twitter by global audiences has been so influential (McGiboney, 2009) that Technorati created a secondary blog site called Twittorati, to show what Technorati's top 100 bloggers were 'tweeting'

---

<sup>10</sup> Whether there is a limit to this capacity or whether each successive generative audience has more or less capacity is not the focus of this conference paper.

<sup>11</sup> One example is that of social network site Friendster, which was hugely popular in 2003 (with an audience of approximately 20 million visitors) and which in the later part of 2005, 'slipped below a million after MySpace and other sites with better music and video capability lured Friendster users away' (Bell, cited in 'MySpace, Facebook and Other Social Networking Sites', 2006, p. 1).

about (Rao, 2009), thus retaining interest for the original Technorati site as well as ‘regular’ blogging sites which did not have the same kind of functionality as Twitter<sup>12</sup>. Although most of these regular blogging sites may have been infrequent or abandoned, millions of people appeared to be using social media, expressing their opinions online at various periods in time, including generating and sharing firsthand perspectives for other people to read.<sup>13</sup> Bell (cited in ‘MySpace, Facebook and Other Social Networking Sites’, 2006) opined that while social network sites can have ‘exponential growth’, they faced ‘mass migration’ when new social network sites with ‘better functionality’ emerged (‘MySpace, Facebook and Other Social Networking Sites’, p. 1).

Nevertheless, if the long-term success of social network sites is dependent on their ability to attract and retain audiences, then the term ‘social media’ would be as transitory as ‘radio telephony’ was to the mobile telephone (Gow & Smith, 2006). This is because only a fraction of the world’s population is actually participating via the Internet in this form of networking and socialising in the present time. Emerging evidence (Holtz, 2006, 2007; Jenkins, 2006; Solis, 2007b; Stone, 2009; Wauters, 2009) suggests that social media may actually be catalysing or directly involved in creating the framework for a broader, more sophisticated new media platform for the future.

The growth of social media audiences in this new generative and networked environment therefore calls for a re-examination of previous assumptions about participatory cultures in the communicative spaces created or facilitated particularly by Internet-based/online media. This mediated social network environment appears to support the mapping and/or articulation of broader conceptual frameworks and linkages between the discursive issues of Internet-based media and public spheres; including areas that have traditionally been considered too ‘soft’ to be democratising to society, such as music and tourism.

Interestingly, when these broader conceptual frameworks and linkages involving different technological, economic and social components are brought together, the result is an infrastructure that makes certain kinds of (human) group actions or activity possible that were not possible before (Rheingold, 2002, p. xii). The act of mapping spaces on the Internet involves generative acts of conceptualising, visualising, creating, representing and recording spaces in a virtual realm. And it is this virtual and generative relationship between audiences/users of social network sites and the Internet that allows for active simulation between public and private spaces, not just their passive representations. For example, on the one hand, a history of social *media* might lead to a technical discussion involving media technology and innovation; on the other hand, a history of *social media* might lead to a discussion on how culture determines what social media would look like, and what the social media comes to mean to audiences through their use (Cosgrove, 1999). In the case of the Internet social media and generative audiences, the culture of social media may be described as a group of private individuals imagining or visualising themselves as an audience or as part of a single public not unlike the emerging bourgeois ‘public sphere’<sup>14</sup> envisioned by Habermas.

<sup>12</sup> By 2008, Technorati.com had tracked approximately 133 million ‘blog records’ since 2002 (Winn, 2009). These blog records did not include the micro-blogging site, Twitter.

<sup>13</sup> Sometimes, contributors are considered ‘Expert’ or given a similar title, based on the frequency and/or volume of content shared in areas that were traditionally the domain of private, corporate (and often specialised) entities

<sup>14</sup> According to Habermas, ‘the public sphere’ was ‘a forum in which the private people come together to form a public, readied themselves to compel public authority to legitimate itself before public opinion’ (Habermas, 1989, pp. 25–26). The idea of the public sphere, in Habermas’ meaning, was a conceptual resource that designated a theatre in modern societies in which political participation was enacted through a verbal medium. It was an institutionalised arena of discursive interaction as it was the space in which citizens deliberated about their common affairs. This arena was conceptually distinct from the state, as it was a site for the production and circulation of discourses that could, in principle, be critical of the state. In the same sense, the public sphere was also conceptually distinct from the economy — it was an arena of discursive relations, not market relations; that is, a theatre for debating and deliberating rather than buying and selling. Thus, the concept of the public sphere helped keep in view the distinctions between state apparatus, economic markets, and democratic associations (or civic groups) — distinctions that were important to Western democratic theory (Tham, 1999, pp. 10–11).

In *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (1989), Habermas told of a public sphere gained by the liberal bourgeoisie and then lost in an epoch of consumerism to a public who 'as readers, listeners, and spectators, could avail themselves via the market of the objects that were subject to discussion' (pp. 36–37). John Hartley (1992) posited that because Habermas' original conceptions of 'the public realm' and 'the public' had literally vanished, it was necessary to look at the mediated form of the public in order to discover the state of the contemporary public domain (p. 1). In March 2006, Habermas commented on the possible role of Internet-based social media, opining that the role of Internet discourse may be both democratising and defocusing:

Use of the Internet has both broadened and fragmented the contexts of communication. This is why the Internet can have a subversive effect on intellectual life in authoritarian regimes. But at the same time, the less formal, horizontal cross-linking of communication channels weakens the achievements of traditional media. This focuses the attention of an anonymous and dispersed public on select topics and information, allowing citizens to concentrate on the same critically filtered issues and journalistic pieces at any given time. The price we pay for the growth in egalitarianism offered by the Internet is the decentralised access to unedited stories. In this medium, contributions by intellectuals lose their power to create a focus (Habermas, 2006).

This paper suggests that in Internet social media, intellectual contributions do not actually lose power to create a focus when those contributions are seen through a 'macro-lens' of mediated collaborative interests involving a (social) network of audiences. With the advent of Internet social media, Habermas' model of 'the public sphere' represented by a universal space or arena of discourse has instead been shown as impractical because Habermas' notion of 'the public' does not consider its generative audience qualities in relation to a multiplicity of discursive space.<sup>15</sup> Instead of being singular or universal, Ross Poole (1989) informs that discursive space had become 'plural' and 'particular' (p. 18) because, as Bill Bonney and Helen Wilson (1983) argued:

There are class interests, individual interests, fluctuating group interests. But to suppose there is such a thing as the public interest is to suppose there is a single 'public' with a unified set of interests which somehow override conflicting and varying individual, class and fractional interests (p. 77).

In a sense, the Habermas' model compared to the generative model proposed in this paper, may be analogous to looking at a motionless, two-dimensional map of the Earth that is now being revealed as a three-dimensional mass moving forward in the form of generative audiences 'orbiting' in endless discursive space around what may be emerging as a common global networked communicative culture.

---

<sup>15</sup> Of 'space', rather than 'spaces': Various studies conducted on how new media communication channels influence productivity and creativity of virtual teams (cited in Gloor, Paasivaara, Schoder, & Willems, 2007) contribute to a theoretical understanding of how social media might influence audience generativity. Peter Gloor's (2006) research on the model of Collaborative Innovation Networks (COINs), for example, suggested that the diffusion of innovation in collaborative knowledge networks followed a 'ripple effect', with COINs at the centre of a set of concentric communities, and where each community is included in a subsequent, larger community. Gloor theorised that innovations rippled from the innermost COIN circle (e.g. Linux creators) to the next larger Collaborative Learning Network (CLN) circle (e.g. Linux maintainer), and then to the surrounding Collaborative Interest Network (CIN) community (e.g. Linux user) (Gloor, 2006). Gloor's ripple of innovations model bears family resemblance with Zittrain's hourglass Internet architecture in that there is an intermediary (represented by the hourglass' funnel neck) between innovation creator and the end user. However, Gloor's central focus was on online communities and how to make their associated collaborative networks more 'active and innovative' (Gloor et al., 2007, p. 6). Gloor et al. (2007) observed that the emerging effect resembled a 'core/periphery' structure (Borgatti & Everett, 1999) with 'small world' properties (Watts, 2003). The online communities consisted of a central cluster of people, the core audience group, forming a high-density network with low 'group betweenness centrality' (GBC) (Gloor et al., 2007, p. 6). The external part was a network forming a ring around the core audience comprising individuals with relatively low density, but high GBC, due to the central core audience group. The secondary audiences in the outer ring (CLN/CIN) had GBC because they were only connected to the core audience rather than directly to each other (Gloor et al., 2007).

Hartley (1992) informed that an individual did not make the public (and therefore the audience) of which he or she was a member. Rather, competing institutions and discourses created very different 'publics', such that each version turned out to be the image of its maker:

They [the media] create a picture of the public, but it goes live, as it were, only when people participate in its creation, not least by turning themselves into the audience. Participation takes the form, among others, of confession, ... requiring constant private soul-searching, comparison, internal interrogation and realignment of the self, and in the process we [the audience] participate in the creation of ourselves as social others; as 'the public' (p. 4).

It is noteworthy that in spite of Habermas' concern that intellectuals would 'lose their power to create a focus' (Habermas, 2006), it was the collective generativity of a collaborative network of intellectuals that has transformed and influenced successive generations of intellectuals and non-intellectuals alike and perhaps for all time, through their contribution of the Internet as an innovative globally focused network of networks: Most of the Internet's founding architects and 'framers' were primarily academic researchers; intellectuals who, in the beginning, did not command vast resources to implement such a global network (Leiner et al., 2003; Zittrain, 2008). In *The Future of the Internet — And How to Stop It* (2008), Zittrain noted that the Internet's design was 'publicly available and freely shared from the earliest moments of its development' and that these intellectuals were, in a sense, both 'amateurs' because 'they undertook their work for the innate interest of it', and 'professionals' because 'they could devote themselves full time to its development' (pp. 27–28).

In the next section, this paper briefly discusses 'audience generativity' and 'social media' use in the music and tourism industries respectively, to represent word-of-mouth advocacy behaviour that can be easily harnessed by both amateurs and professionals, private individuals and corporate organisations, to generate richer narratives and experiences about a particular product, service, or brand. This is because the notion of sustaining audience interest online has so far been linked to 'stickiness' and competitive advantage (Locke, Searls, Weinberger, & Levine, 1999; Siegel, 1999), and these are important to cultural industries, particularly the music events and tourism industries where audiences might traditionally come together to participate in a music or tourism event, and then disperse after the event, not unlike a modern-day flash mob.

## Music and tourism social networks

In this section, this paper briefly discusses how audiences are compelling the tourism industry to harness social media as a corporate communication tool to (re-) engage audiences in the light of growing evidence of a seemingly new ecosystem for supporting the socialisation of information — thus facilitating new conversations that can have a 'local start', yet 'global impact' (Solis, 2007a). This section also briefly discuss how music artistes / producers / distributors are now able to use social media to extend their sphere of influence in the music recording industry beyond traditional geographic boundaries and easily share visualisations of their everyday lives and travel schedules with their respective 'tribes' (or fans). In earlier sections, this paper discussed how these rich narratives and experiences, through audience generativity, can impact public opinion and the sustainability of new marketing and public relations efforts by those industries.

The travel and tourism industry has only recently started to try to change the way it reaches out to its customers and value chain through the online social media (Green, 2007). A 2007 Forrester Research report suggested that the United States travel industry was 'backward' when it came to meeting travellers' online expectations. The Forrester report claimed that 43 percent of online leisure travellers in the United States believed that travel websites' shopping experiences had become less useful;<sup>16</sup> 15 percent felt that the Internet did not help them save money;<sup>17</sup> and

---

<sup>16</sup> Forrester's Consumer Technographics North America Q4 2007 Healthcare and Travel Online Survey.

11 percent of online leisure hotel guests thought it was more difficult to shop for travel online in the present time than when they started.<sup>17</sup> And while a significant 47 percent of travellers had created user profiles on travel sites, more than half of those travellers (55 percent) said they were not pleased with the value the profiles provided. In fact, although online travel sales appeared to be growing, according to the Forrester Research survey of more than 60,000 Internet users in the United States, 9 percent fewer people booked travel online in 2007 than in 2005 (Harteveldt, 2007; Tedeschi, 2007).

At the Hotel Electronic Distribution Network Association's (HEDNA) December 2007 Conference, Henry Harteveldt complained that instead of presenting tailored information to guests, 'we send guests into information comas, instead of helping them' (Harteveldt, 2007). Harteveldt, like Zittrain (Zittrain, 2006), seemed to assume that travel audiences were not equipped to produce counteractive responses to the situation. Nevertheless, based on another study of more than 2,000 United States-based Internet users in October 2007, a comScore/Kelsey Group survey revealed that nearly one in four Internet users (24 percent) used online reviews before paying for a service delivered offline. In addition, consumers were willing to pay at least 20 percent more for services with a rating of 'Excellent' or '5-star', than for the same service with a rating of 'Good' or '4-star' ('Online Consumer-Generated Reviews Have Significant Impact on Offline Purchase Behavior', 2007).

Conversely, a 2007 International Visitor Survey (refer to Table 1) conducted by Tourism Research Australia showed that 62 percent of international visitors used the Internet for information before coming to Australia, compared with 22 percent in 2003.

### Table 1: Internet usage of the top 10 markets

Germany, USA and UK had the highest Internet usage for information gathering prior to visiting Australia. Hongkong and Malaysia had the lowest levels.<sup>19</sup>

Country of Residence	% of visitors using the Internet for travel-related information	Estimated Visitors
Germany	67%	146,000
USA	63%	429,000
UK	61%	643,000
Japan	59%	531,000
Singapore	55%	229,000
Korea	54%	232,000
China	53%	340,000
New Zealand	52%	1,025,000
Malaysia	50%	143,000
Hongkong	49%	133,000

The Tourism Research Australia survey also found that the Internet played a greater role in travel planning once the decision had been made on a destination rather than influencing the choice of which destination to visit. Specifically, to help plan trip itinerary and to look for airfares or schedules for travel to Australia were key reasons for using the Internet amongst visitors to Australia (refer to Table 2).

<sup>17</sup> Forrester's Consumer Technographics North America Q3 2007 Mail Study.

<sup>18</sup> Forrester's Consumer Technographics North America Q4 2007 Healthcare and Travel Online Survey.

<sup>19</sup> Tourism Research Australia, International Visitor Survey (Year ended Dec 2007). (Base: All visitors aged 15 years and over).

**Table 2: Reasons for using the Internet**

Of all the international visitors 32 percent made a booking using the Internet.<sup>20</sup>

To find out more about Australia after you decided to visit	52%
To help plan your Australian trip itinerary	43%
To look for airfares or air schedules for travel to Australia	42%
To find out about accommodation in Australia	39%
To find out about events or activities	32%
To help plan transport options within Australia	20%
To look for airfares or air schedules for travel within Australia	16%
To help decide whether or not to visit	11%
To find a travel agent in Australia	7%

This paper acknowledges there were various reasons for the difference in attitudes and habits reported between the United States study and the Australian study. One of them is because of differences in the way their respective research methodologies were constructed. Another reason is because marketing in the tourism industry has traditionally been focused on tourism and hospitality destinations and outlets with marketing strategies being related to the products on offer rather than focused on the consumer (Williams, 2006). However, it was clear ~~is~~ that the Internet has an increasingly significant role to play in travellers' decisions.<sup>21</sup>

Nick Baker, the executive general manager marketing for Tourism Australia, identified social media as one of the key ways Tourism Australia was using to market Australia internationally as a destination:

... because it gives us opportunities to have people tell their stories or their passions about Australia or what they're interested in to people who would come in the future (Baker, cited in Crampton, 2009).

By referring to 'people tell their stories or their passions ... to people who would come in the future', Baker was inadvertently referring to a characteristic of audience generativity discussed earlier in this paper. In a video interview with Thomas Crampton of Ogilvy Public Relations, Baker explained why Tourism Australia sponsored a visiting 'opinion leaders' program':

We looked at some of the commentary that's come back and whether that's just been on our visiting opinion leaders' program where we bring bloggers, global bloggers down to talk about things that they're interested in, like we've just done with Scott Schuman who's The Sartorialist and talks about culture, lifestyle, fashion ... and his blog ... And he's gone back ... an certainly from the results of messages that have been posted on his blog, it would certainly seem that people have taken those images and said 'that's fantastic, that's beautiful', next step 'come to Australia' (Baker, cited in Crampton, 2009).

<sup>20</sup> Tourism Research Australia, International Visitor Survey (Year ended Dec 2007). (Base: All visitors aged 15 years and over).

<sup>21</sup> For example, in September 2007, 'Where I've Been' held the top spot for travel applications on Facebook, making it one of the most popular overall applications. With 2.6 million users for 'Where I've Been' at the top, the Number Two application (i.e. [TripAdvisor](#), a travel-related website) came in with less than half the users at 1.2 million. Of the 3,400 over total Facebook applications, the 'Where I've Been' map was ranked Number 22 on Facebook's 'Most Popular Download' list and it was estimated that 6 percent of Facebook's 30 million users were using 'Where I've Been'. The 'Where I've Been' application appeared as a world map on a user's Facebook or MySpace profile page online. Users could share personalised maps with friends and highlight the countries he or she has been to, lived in, or wanted to go by clicking on them and changing the colour ('Facebook's "Where I've Been" launches on MySpace', 2007), almost as if in a conscious and collective effort to reconstruct their three-dimensional travel experiences and yet-to-happen aspirations for travel on a two dimensional map of the world.

Baker's description of Tourism Australia's use of the social media reinforces this paper's argument that there exists a multiplicity of discursive space in the social media such that Tourism Australia is now able to access (generative) audiences comprising millions of individuals.<sup>22</sup> Such access enables Tourism Australia to first create awareness about Australia from a wider variety or multiplicity of perspectives about Australia than ever before, allowing for a positive, perhaps attractive, visualisation of Australia to take shape in the minds of individuals from whatever reading of Australia each individual might feel comfortable to relate to — ultimately allowing the individual to decide on Australia as his/her personal preferred tourism destination. Not only private/commercial markets, but governments too, are now able to access and interact with generative audiences more than before. At the 2009 Asian Marketing Effectiveness Festival in Hong Kong, Baker emphasised the ease by which this could be done, when he reportedly said that in 2008, 23 million people around the world had effectively paid to see the Baz Luhrmann film *Australia*, which was essentially a long advertisement for Australia as a tourist destination (Crampton, 2009). As Crampton observed:

[V]arious levels of Australian government have been on the bleeding edge of Social Media promotion. Queensland ran a competition for the 'The Best Job in the World' to find a blogger and Tourism Australia has one of the highest profile blogger outreach campaigns (Crampton, 2009).

However, it remains to be seen whether more organisational entities entering the discursive space might change the priorities and interests — representing a shift in power — of the components in that space. Chris Locke, Doc Searls, David Weinberger and Rick Levine, reminds via the 95 theses that made up *The Cluetrain Manifesto* (1999) that markets are human 'conversations'; and which implied that most organisations only knew how to communicate, in a corporate voice, what they wanted their markets to hear. The manifesto suggested that this misalignment would lead to mistrust due to a lack of authenticity and respect, and set the scene for a new competitive advantage for organisations who are willing to engage in more personalised two-way (asymmetrical) discussions with their markets, listening to their concerns and responding honestly and openly (Locke et al., 1999)

Like the tourism industry, the mainstream music recording industry is only now dramatically trying to change its business approach after years of trying to control the distribution network of its products, from that of a gatekeeper function, to syndication, to engaging audiences and encouraging audiences to be part of the distribution process by referring whatever music they like to their personal online social networks (Goldstone, 2006). Long after the introduction of the 'MP3' (which became an international standard in 1991)<sup>23</sup> and after nearly 20 billion music tracks had been illegally swapped or downloaded via the Internet (IFPI, 2006), the MP3 blog has emerged as a powerful marketing and promotion tool for bands and labels and a useful music recommendation source for music fans. A MP3 blog typically employs a variety of different means of distribution, including direct downloading, linked downloading and aggregating.

Travis Heynen (cited in Goldstone, 2006, p. 1), editor of *BIGSTEREO* music blog, observed that many MP3 blogs were started by people who wanted to introduce other music fans to music they might not be aware of.<sup>24</sup> In *MP3 Blogs: A Silver Bullet for the Music Industry or a Smoking Gun for Copyright Infringement?*, Andrew Goldstone (2006) explained how positive niche conversations about a new music band might spread virally online throughout the immediate niche community and then into the mainstream.

---

<sup>22</sup> In the video-recorded interview with Thomas Crampton, Nick Baker stated that 3 million people read *The Sartorialist*.

<sup>23</sup> MPEG-1 Audio Layer 3 was approved as an ISO/IEC standard in 1991.

<sup>24</sup> Andrew Goldstone's E-mail Interview with Travis Heynen, (<http://this.bigstereo.net/>) (10 Apr 2006).

A Gartner Group and Berkman Center For Internet & Society report on consumer taste sharing in the online music business showed that not only passive recommendation systems via collaborative filtering, but also 'direct' / 'active' taste sharing were very important for the individual user and had high impact on the individual's purchasing behaviour (Slater & McGuire, 2005). For example, instead of primarily music charts, radio presenters, music disc jockeys, or music videos shaping how audiences hear and view music, both musicians and fans now have a greater opportunity to hear from each other firsthand through the social media — by creating and posting playlists, commenting on artistes, showing personalised profiles on music-related social network sites iLike or MySpace or others. These networking tools allow audiences to play a greater role in generating a culture of sharing and critique, which in turn, generates more audiences (Slater & McGuire, 2005). More importantly, in 2005, nearly 25 percent of frequent online music users said that the ability to share music with others in some fashion was a key criterion when selecting an online music service.

Interestingly, the Gartner Group and Berkman Center report noted that 10 percent of early adopters stated that they often made music purchases based on others' recommendations. One-third of early adopters of digital media surveyed stated that they were interested in online music discovery and recommendation technology that is actually powered by their taste in music. Some of the most-regular users of online music services, whether free peer-to-peer (P2P) or paid services, were the most interested in consumer-generated recommendation tools (Slater & McGuire, 2005).

This paper makes an observation that certain social network sites, for example Twitter and iLike, have endeavoured to integrate their social network applications with other new and existing social network sites and this appears to be the leading trend across all platforms of social media. The cross-platform integration appears to be a means to continue to increase membership registrations, as the rate by which new social network sites are appearing (seemingly in competition with each other) surpasses the rate by which online audiences are growing. The cross-platform integration of social media sites appears to reinforce this paper's argument of a multiplicity of discursive space<sup>15</sup> in the context of generative audiences. This is because an individual member of a social network site is likely to have at least one other membership with a different social network site or other form of the social media platform (e.g. a mobile version).

Social music discovery service, iLike, for example, announced in April 2007 that it had surpassed one million registered users after just six months in existence, and was then processing over 200 million monthly track plays based on enabling users to log their listening habits on their iPods and PCs ('One Million People Use iLike', 2007). Just over a year later, iLike had become an international phenomenon with over 30 million registered users ('iLike Surpasses 30 Million Users', 2008), owing much of its success to the popularity of Facebook, MySpace and other social network sites. Integration with social network sites which had their own millions of users has played a significant role in iLike's growth strategy. iLike has sought to make integration between its service, Facebook, MySpace and other leading social network sites 'as easy and effortless as possible' for the musicians who maintain profiles (Garrett, 2007) and this has attracted 'more than 200,000 musicians, including leading artists from all genres of music', actively using the iLike 'Universal Artist Dashboard' to manage an online presence syndicated across Facebook, hi5, Bebo, and others ('More Than 200,000 Artists Now Manage Pages on Facebook, hi5, Bebo, and Beyond Using iLike Dashboard', 2008). Internationally renowned artistes were among the tens of thousands of artists that regularly used iLike to syndicate their songs, videos, photos, fan bulletins, concert information and exclusive content via iLike's 'Post Once, Publish Everywhere' platform. iLike's Chief Executive Officer Ali Partovi observed:

With the rise of new social networks, artists are finding it increasingly difficult to keep track of the options, and time-consuming to maintain duplicate presences everywhere ... Our push-button syndication solution solves a real need, giving artists the ability to reach more fans with less effort, and freeing them up to focus on what really matters: the music ('More Than 200,000 Artists Now Manage Pages on Facebook, hi5, Bebo, and Beyond Using iLike Dashboard', 2008).

A level playing field has emerged through the social media, where Asian music and even alternative music which once existed as an 'other' to mainstream music, are now being featured more prominently on the same platforms as Western commercial music and made more accessible to a wider range of both niche and mainstream audiences than before (Carew, 2009)

## Converging tourism and music space

In 2009, Twitter's co-founder Biz Stone announced on the Twitter Blog that Twitter was gearing up to launch a new feature which would make Twitter 'truly location-aware'. Stone wrote:

A new API will allow developers to add latitude and longitude to any tweet. Folks will need to activate this new feature by choice because it will be off by default and the exact location data won't be stored for an extended period of time. However, if people do opt-in to sharing location on a tweet-by-tweet basis, compelling context will be added to each burst of information. (Stone, 2009)

Arguably one of the 20 most popular websites worldwide ('twitter.com -Traffic Details from Alexa', 2009), Twitter's founders believed that the Geolocation Application Programming Interface (API) would give them the ability to attach geographic metadata to tweets to provide additional context with a Twitter user's update. Along with the option to tag updates, users would then be able to search for nearby tweets and view the geo metadata in user timelines. The additional context would, in theory, allow Twitter to deliver more localised experiences to its users (Stone, 2009).

From a marketing communications standpoint, the implication of the Geolocation API is possibly more profound than Stone (2009) has publicly theorised. Basically, the API would allow local businesses or performing artistes that use Twitter, to know other Twitter users in the same vicinity; locate them, follow their tweets, and converse with them as though they were already real-life customers/audiences. When integrated across multiple social networking platforms, this API represents a simplified, cost-free (or low cost) form of direct marketing that small and medium businesses can tap on and see immediate results in terms of quantifying their sphere of influence, brand awareness creation and customer reach. It also represents a way music event and tourism destination promoters (including consumers and audiences) can stay informed of radical changes in the physical external environment. War, terrorism, political upheaval, the spread of infectious diseases, airline restructuring and the advancement and use of technology are just a few of the events that have a profound impact on tourism today. With independent music artistes, especially those who might have tight promotion budgets, they can now plan to perform at locations where they know they have a critical mass of fans (Lawson, 2009; Pearson, 2008; Ryzin, 2009). Furthermore, a blog written by freelance musician and writer David Hahn reflects how traditional music and travel interests confluence with the social media:

I stumbled across a site today ... Visit ArtistData.com ... If you sign up for this site, which is free, you can submit your show and concert schedule to them and they will in turn post it to all of your social networking profiles for you. In other words, you post the show, location, time, etc., click enter, and BOOM! It's loaded onto every site you have a profile on. They also have some interesting features like submission to local press at your concert location, an automatic Kayak search for hotels close to your venue, or Google maps searches for coffee shops, or music stores (Hahn, n.d.).<sup>25</sup>

It is important to appreciate that while the Internet has enabled the public to be able to compare and switch websites (and therefore, switch product choices) at the click of a mouse button, thereby offering wider choice between competing services while the user is able to remain anonymous from the supplier; that anonymity rested on two factors: (i) the daunting cost for organisations to find the individual user, and (ii) current software technology costs to support the data mining and search for

---

<sup>25</sup> Kayak.com is a travel search engine website based in the United States.

the user's whereabouts — both challenges which can now be easily surmounted with the application of the Twitter Geolocation API in cooperation with other web usage tracking applications. In the social context, online social media proffers a sense of 'privacy' — in the sense that there seems to be no one physically around to watch the user shop or conduct transactions. So sitting in the comfort of their home, consumers might think they have private choices at their fingertips (Vijayasathya & Jones, 2000) even though their online behaviour may be monitored ('Implementing social media monitoring', n.d.; 'PR Newswire Launches Comprehensive Social Media Monitoring Tool', 2009).

Surely Habermas (2006) was being imprecise when he described the public as 'anonymous and dispersed'. Instead of weakening the achievements of traditional media as Habermas had claimed (2006), there is emerging evidence that the 'less formal, horizontal cross-linking of communication channels' is supporting and shaping current and renewed interest in traditional market areas of tourism and music, which are still using traditional media such as print, radio and television, to communicate with their respective audiences both online and offline.

Furthermore, as social network sites and social media were sprouting from the United States as new media exports to the rest of the world in the period of 2001 to 2002,<sup>26</sup> Howard Rheingold (2002) observed how the technology enabling social media was beginning to converge with mobile telephony. In Smart Mobs: The Next Social Revolution, Rheingold (2002) proposed that 'social practices', rather than hardware or software, would become the next 'killer apps' for the mobile info-communications industry:

The most far-reaching changes come ... from the kinds of relationships, enterprises, communities, and markets that the infrastructure makes possible ... Smart mobs consist of people who are able to act in concert even if they don't know each other ... because they carry devices that possess both communication and computing capabilities (p. xii).

Rheingold's (2002) observation that mobile devices would help individuals coordinate actions with others was also about how groups of people (namely, audiences to the marketers of those devices) would gain new forms of 'social power' to organise their activities 'just in time and just in place' as a consequence of that same ability to coordinate actions with others (pp. xii–xiii). These forms of social power would enable what Rheingold called 'associations of amateurs' who were quicker to adapt to change than the 'established industry leaders' to find innovative new ways to profit from a fast-evolving social practices mediated environment (p. xiii). Rheingold (2002) postulated that large numbers of small groups of individuals using the new media to their individual benefit, would create 'emergent effects that would nourish some existing institutions and ways of life and dissolve others' (p. xiii). These 'emergent effects' bear close family resemblance, in terms of producing and creating, to audience generativity and social media, which has been a focus of this paper.

## Conclusion

This paper has applied audience generativity specifically to the context of social media audiences and contends that there is no empirical evidence to demonstrate that networked systems technology (the Internet) and machines (the PC) have the propensity to generate anything without some initial form of human audience participation or intervention. If today this participation involves audiences in actively and generatively shaping both media content and public discourse, then this paper contends, real generativity resides with audiences, not the Internet or technology. This paper has briefly examined generativity in the cultural industries of tourism and music, which at the current

---

<sup>26</sup> Technorati.com reported that statistical studies conducted by comScore MediaMetrix, eMarketer and Universal McCann showed that blogs had become 'a global phenomenon that has hit the mainstream' (Winn, 2009).

time, are coming to terms with how to relate better with their online audiences and who, as audiences themselves, are being targeted by the social media for advertising sponsorship and marketing referrals. A new, more holistic structural transformation model has been highlighted, involving an increasingly popular social media landscape, that has been called many different names and approached in different ways in both popular and scholarly discourse — from knowledge management, wisdom of the crowds, and communities of practice (Gloor, Laubacher, Dynes, & Zhao, 2003; Surowiecki, 2005; Wenger, McDermott, & Snyder, 2002), to ‘collective intelligence’ (Levy, 1997), ‘flash mobs’ (Wasik, 2006) and ‘smart mobs’ (Rheingold, 2002) — to reflect different perspectives of what is arguably influenced by the same generative phenomena found in this paper’s model of audiences.

Thus, I have undertaken to research this topic further in my doctoral research thesis to re-emphasise the need for a multidimensional approach to understand the social media phenomenon, as stated at the beginning of this paper. More in-depth study on how generative audiences use social media to pursue their interests in music and tourism or other converging market areas, would contribute significantly to new theoretical approaches to thinking about social media audiences as ‘a cultural resource that plays a key leadership role in the process of consensus formation in society’ (Meadows, 1998). This paper has explained what sort of concept is ‘the media audience’ as well as *why* generative audiences use social media. By considering the social interactions between ‘members of the public’, the ‘media-public interface’, and ‘media output’ itself, it becomes possible to empirically observe through qualitative methods how generative audiences link participatory experience and reflection to generate meaning (political or otherwise) in the active and generative processes and conditions of sense making (Dahlgren & Sparks, 1991, p. 16). The basic rationale is that what people and organisations know how to do now — that is, to be generative — have the potential to influence what they will have the freedom to do in the future. The same can be said for how audiences and publics, consumers and producers, are mobilised now for the future.

## REFERENCES

---

- Agre, P. (1998). The Internet and Public Discourse. [Online Journal]. *First Monday*, 3(3).
- Anandarajan, M., Simmers, C. A., & Teo, T. S. H. (Eds.). (2006). *The Internet And Workplace Transformation* (illustrated ed.). New York: M. E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of human existence: Isolation and communication in Western man*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Balnaves, M., O’Regan, T., & Sternberg, J. (2002). *Mobilising the audience*. St Lucia, Qld: University of Queensland Press.
- Bennett, W. L., & Entman, R. M. (Eds.). (2001). *Mediated politics: communication in the future of democracy* (illustrated ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bingemann, M. (2008, 15 Jul). Business yet to scratch social networking surface. *The Australian*. Retrieved 9 Nov 2009, from <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/news/business-yet-to-scratch-social-networking-surface/story-e6frgao6-1111116912605>.
- Bonney, B., & Wilson, H. (1983). *Australia’s Commercial Media*. South Melbourne: MacMillan.
- Borgatti, S. P., & Everett, M. G. (1999). Models of core / periphery structures. [PDF]. *Social Networks*, 21, 375–395.
- Bosses ‘should embrace Facebook’. (2008, 29 Oct). *BBC News*. Retrieved 29 Oct 2008, from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/go/pr/fr/-/1/hi/business/7695716.stm>.
- Boyd, D. M. (2006). Friends, friendsters, and top 8: Writing community into being on social network sites. [Peer-reviewed online journal]. *First Monday*, 11(12).
- Boyd, S. (2007, 17 Feb). /Message: Scoble Asks What Is Social Media? Retrieved 11 Sep 2008, from [http://www.stoweboyd.com/message/2007/02/scoble\\_asks\\_wha.html](http://www.stoweboyd.com/message/2007/02/scoble_asks_wha.html).

- Carew, A. (2009, 24 Sep). Alternative Music 101 — Your FAQ Primer. *About.com: Alternative Music* Retrieved 01 Oct 2009, from <http://altmusic.about.com/od/historyofaltindiemusic/a/altmusic101.htm>.
- Connolly, F. (2007, 20 Dec). Channel 7 stars' Facebook ban *The Daily Telegraph* Retrieved 11 Nov 2009, from <http://www.news.com.au/entertainment/story/0,23663,22952746-10229,00.html>.
- Cosgrove, D. (Ed.). (1999). *Mappings*. London: Reaktion Books.
- Crampton, T. (2009, 1 Jun). Tourism Australia: Can Social Media Attract Visitors? *Thomas Crampton / Social Media in China and across Asia* Retrieved 13 Nov 2009, from <http://www.thomascrampton.com/australia/tourism-australia-can-social-media-attract-visitors/>.
- Creative Industries: UNESCO-CULTURE. (2007, 28 Sep 2009). *UNESCO Culture* Retrieved 8 Nov 2009, from [http://upo.unesco.org/details.aspx?Code\\_Livre=3387](http://upo.unesco.org/details.aspx?Code_Livre=3387).
- Culture, Trade and Globalization: Questions and Answers*. (2003). (2nd ed.): UNESCO Publishing.
- Dahlgren, P., & Sparks, C. (Eds.). (1991). *Communication and Citizenship: Journalism and the Public Sphere in the New Media Age*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Erikson, E. H. (1950). *Childhood And Society*. NY: Norton.
- Facebook's 'Where I've Been' launches on MySpace. (2007, 7 Sep). *Hotelmarketing.com*. Retrieved 11 Sep 2008, from [http://www.hotelmarketing.com/index.php/content/article/070907\\_facebooks\\_where\\_ive\\_been\\_launches\\_on\\_myspace/](http://www.hotelmarketing.com/index.php/content/article/070907_facebooks_where_ive_been_launches_on_myspace/).
- Fono, D., & Raynes-Goldie, K. (2006). Hyperfriendship and Beyond: Friends and Social Norms on LiveJournal. In M. Consalvo & C. Haythornthwaite (Eds.), *Internet Research Annual: Selected Papers from the Association of Internet Researchers Conference* (Vol. 4). NY: Peter Lang.
- Friedman, L. J., de St. Aubin, E., McAdams, D. P., & Kim, T.-C. (2004). Erik Erikson on Generativity: A Biographer's Perspective. In *The generative society: Caring for future generations*. (pp. 257–264). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Garrett, M. (2007, 4 Oct). iLike Introduces New Facebook Musician Platform. *Profy: Internet news and commentary* Retrieved 27 Oct 2008, from <http://profy.com/2007/10/04/ilike-introduces-new-facebook-musician-platform/>.
- Gillmor, D. (2004). The Former Audience Joins the Party. In *We the Media: Grassroots Journalism by the People, for the People*: Authorama.com.
- Gloor, P. A. (2006). *Swarm Creativity: Competitive Advantage through Collaborative Innovation Networks* (1st ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Gloor, P. A., Laubacher, R., Dynes, S. B. C., & Zhao, Y. (2003). *Visualization of Communication Patterns in Collaborative Innovation Networks — Analysis of Some W3C Working Groups*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 12th International Conference On Information And Knowledge Management. Retrieved 29 Oct 2009,
- Gloor, P. A., Paasivaara, M., Schoder, D., & Willems, P. (2007). Finding Collaborative Innovation Networks Through Correlating Performance With Social Network Structure. *Journal of Production Research*.
- Goldstone, A. (2006). MP3 Blogs: A Silver Bullet for the Music Industry or a Smoking Gun for Copyright Infringement? (Publication. Retrieved 13 Nov 2009, from Social Science Electronic Publishing: <http://ssrn.com/paper=930270>).
- Gow, G. A., & Smith, R. K. (2006). *Mobile and wireless communications: an introduction* (illustrated ed.): McGraw-Hill International.
- Green, C. E. (2007). The Travel Marketer's Guide to Social Media and Social Networking. Paper presented at the HSMIAI Hotel Sales Strategy Conference. from <http://www.hospitalitynet.org/news/4032175.print>.

- Habermas, J. (1989). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society* (T. Burger & F. Lawrence, Trans.). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Habermas, J. (2006). Towards a United States of Europe (Publication., from signandsight.com: <http://www.signandsight.com/features/676.html>).
- Hahn, D. J. (n.d.). Submit Your Concerts to Social Networks All At Once. *MusicianWages.com* — *The Website For Working Musicians* Retrieved 8 Oct 2009, from <http://www.musicianwages.com/the-working-musician/submit-your-concerts-to-social-networks-all-at-once/>.
- Halloran, J. (1970). *The Effects of Television*. London: Panther.
- Harteveldt, H. H. (2007). *Navigating Choppy Waters — Keynote Presentation*. Paper presented at the HEDNA December 2007 Conference. Retrieved 15 May 2008, from [http://www.hedna.org/networking/conference\\_dec\\_07.cfm](http://www.hedna.org/networking/conference_dec_07.cfm).
- Hartley, J. (1992). *The Politics of Pictures: The creation of the public in the age of popular media*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Havenstein, H. (2008, 13 Aug). Facebook dominates worldwide social networking, study finds. *Computerworld: Networking & Internet*. Retrieved 22 Aug 2008, from [http://www.computerworld.com/action/article.do?command=viewArticleBasic&articleId=9112547&intsrc=news\\_ts\\_head](http://www.computerworld.com/action/article.do?command=viewArticleBasic&articleId=9112547&intsrc=news_ts_head).
- Hesmondhalgh, D. (2002). *The Cultural Industries* (1st ed.). London: Sage.
- Hogan, R. (1987). Personality psychology: Back to basics. In J. Aronoff, A. I. Rabin & R. A. Zucker (Eds.), *The emergence of personality* (pp. 79–104). NY: Springer.
- Holtz, S. (2006, 17 Apr). Blogger Relations for Click.TV. a shel of my former self: blogging at the intersection of communication and technology Retrieved 25 Sep 2008, from [http://blog.holtz.com/index.php/blogger\\_relations\\_for\\_clicktv/](http://blog.holtz.com/index.php/blogger_relations_for_clicktv/).
- Holtz, S. (2007, 17 Apr). Coca-Cola's community approach to Second Life. a shel of my former self: blogging at the intersection of communication and technology Retrieved 25 Sep 2008, from [http://blog.holtz.com/index.php/coca\\_colas\\_community\\_approach\\_to\\_second\\_life/](http://blog.holtz.com/index.php/coca_colas_community_approach_to_second_life/).
- IFPI. (2006). *The Recording Industry 2006 Piracy Report: Protecting Creativity In Music*. London: International Federation of the Phonographic Industry.
- iLike Surpasses 30 Million Users, Unveils New Ad Platform For Concerts And Full-Song Playback Powered By Rhapsody. (2008, 21 Jul). *iLike Press Releases* Retrieved 27 Oct 2008, from [http://blog.ilike.com/ilike\\_press\\_releases/2008/07/ilike-surpasses.html](http://blog.ilike.com/ilike_press_releases/2008/07/ilike-surpasses.html).
- Implementing social media monitoring. (n.d.). *New Zealand Government Web Standards* Retrieved 8 Oct 2009, from <http://www.webstandards.govt.nz/implementing-social-media-monitoring/>.
- Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence culture: where old and new media collide*. New York; London: New York University Press.
- Kotre, J. (1984). *Outliving the self: Generativity and the interpretation of lives*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kotre, J. (n.d.). Generativity and the Generative Process. *Author John Kotre* Retrieved 29 Oct 2009, from <http://www.johnkotre.com/generativity.htm>.
- Lasswell, H. D. (1948). *Power and Personality*. NY: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Lawson, S. (2009, 15 Feb). Real Life Touring. A Social Media-Fuelled Tale. *Steve's Blog: Solo Bass & Beyond* Retrieved 8 Oct 2009, from <http://www.stevelawson.net/wordpress/2009/02/real-life-touring-a-social-media-fuelled-tale/>.
- Leiner, B. M., Cerf, V. G., Clark, D. D., Kahn, R. E., Kleinrock, L., Lynch, D. C., et al. (2003, 10 Dec). Internet Society (ISOC) All About The Internet: History of the Internet. Retrieved 21 Oct 2009, from <http://www.isoc.org/internet/history/brief.shtml>.

- Levy, P. (1997). *Collective intelligence: mankind's emerging world in cyberspace* (R. Bononno, Trans.). NY: Plenum.
- Locke, C., Searls, D., Weinberger, D., & Levine, R. (1999, Apr). the cluetrain manifesto. Retrieved 8 Oct 2009, from <http://www.cluetrain.com>.
- McAdams, D. P., Hart, H. M., Maruna, S., & de St. Aubin, E. (1998). The anatomy of generativity. In *Generativity and adult development: How and why we care for the next generation*. (pp. 7–43): American Psychological Association.
- McGiboney, M. (2009, 18 Mar). Twitter's Tweet Smell Of Success. *Nielsen Wire* Nielsen Online. Retrieved 2 Oct 2009, from [http://blog.nielsen.com/nielsenwire/online\\_mobile/twitters-tweet-smell-of-success/](http://blog.nielsen.com/nielsenwire/online_mobile/twitters-tweet-smell-of-success/).
- Meadows, M. (1998). Journalism as a Cultural Resource. In M. Breen (Ed.), *Journalism: theory and practice* (pp. 67–82). Paddington, NSW: Macleay Press.
- More Than 200,000 Artists Now Manage Pages on Facebook, hi5, Bebo, and Beyond Using iLike Dashboard. (2008, 5 Mar). *iLike Press Releases* Retrieved 27 Oct 2008, from [http://blog.ilike.com/ilike\\_press\\_releases/2008/03/more-than-20000.html](http://blog.ilike.com/ilike_press_releases/2008/03/more-than-20000.html).
- MySpace, Facebook and Other Social Networking Sites: Hot Today, Gone Tomorrow? (2006, 3 May). *Knowledge@Wharton* Retrieved 30 Oct 2009, from <http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article.cfm?articleid=1463>.
- One Million People Use iLike. (2007, 24 Apr). *iLike Press Releases* Retrieved 27 Oct 2008, from [http://blog.ilike.com/ilike\\_press\\_releases/2007/04/one\\_million\\_peo.html](http://blog.ilike.com/ilike_press_releases/2007/04/one_million_peo.html).
- Online Consumer-Generated Reviews Have Significant Impact on Offline Purchase Behavior. (2007, 29 Nov). *Press Release* Retrieved 5 May 2008, from <http://www.comscore.com/press/release.asp?press=1928>.
- Palotie, L. (2008, 25 Jun). Facebook Gets Down to Business. *The New York Times*. Retrieved 9 Nov 2009, from [http://www.nytimes.com/inc\\_com/inc1214228836673.html?ref=small](http://www.nytimes.com/inc_com/inc1214228836673.html?ref=small).
- Pearson, C. (2008, 31 Mar). Social Media Starter Moves for Entertainers. *chrisbrogan.com — community and social media* Retrieved 8 Oct 2009, from <http://www.chrisbrogan.com/social-media-starter-moves-for-entertainers/>.
- Phillips, J. G. (2006). The Psychology of Internet Use and Misuse. In M. Anandarajan, C. A. Simmers & T. S. H. Teo (Eds.), *The Internet And Workplace Transformation* (illustrated ed., pp. 41–62). New York: M. E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Poole, R. (1989). Public Spheres. In H. Wilson (Ed.), *Australian Communications and the Public Sphere* (pp. 6–26). South Melbourne: MacMillan.
- PR Newswire Launches Comprehensive Social Media Monitoring Tool. (2009, 4 Jun). *PR Newswire Asia* Retrieved 8 Oct 2009, from <http://www.prnasia.com/pr/09/06/09359711-1.html>.
- Rao, L. (2009, 7 July). Twittorati Will Show You How Awesomely Fascinating Bloggers' Lives Are (Or Not). *TechCrunch* Retrieved 2 Oct 2009, from <http://www.techcrunch.com/2009/07/07/twittorati-will-show-you-how-awesomely-fascinating-bloggers-lives-are-or-not/>.
- Rheingold, H. (2002). *Smart Mobs: The Next Social Revolution*. Cambridge, MA: Basic Books.
- Rosen, J. (2006, 27 Jun). The People Formerly Known as the Audience. *PressThink: Ghost of Democracy in the Media Machine* Retrieved 2 Oct 2009, from [http://journalism.nyu.edu/pubzone/weblogs/pressthink/2006/06/27/ppl\\_frmr.html](http://journalism.nyu.edu/pubzone/weblogs/pressthink/2006/06/27/ppl_frmr.html).
- Ryzin, J. C. v. (2009, 11 Apr). Want an audience at the concert hall? Twitter, Twitter, Twitter. *Austin360.com* Retrieved 8 Oct 2009, from <http://www.austin360.com/arts/content/arts/stories/2009/04/0412burritt.html>.
- Siegel, D. (1999). *Futurize Your Enterprise: Business Strategy in the Age of the E-customer*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Slater, D., & McGuire, M. (2005, 13 Dec). Consumer Taste Sharing Is Driving the Online Music Business and Democratizing Culture. Retrieved 13 Nov 2009, from <http://cyber.law.harvard.edu/node/409>.
- Social Media Definition. (2008). *Social Media Club* Retrieved 11 Sep 2008, from <http://www.socialmediacub.org/about/>.
- Solis, B. (2007a, 11 Jun). The Future of Communications — A Manifesto for Integrating Social Media into Marketing. Retrieved 11 Sep 2008, from <http://docs.thinkfree.com/docs/view.php?dsn=819339>.
- Solis, B. (2007b, 19 Feb). What's Wrong with Social Media?. *PR 2.0: The Future of Communications Starts Here* Retrieved 12 Sep 2008, from <http://www.briansolis.com/2007/02/whats-wrong-with-social-media.html>.
- Srivastava, L. (2005). Mobile phones and the evolution of social behaviour. [Research article]. *Behaviour and Information Technology*, 24(2), 111–129.
- Stewart, A. J., Franz, C., & Layton, L. (1988). The Changing Self: Using Personal Documents to Study Lives. *Journal of Personality*, 56(1), 41–74.
- Stone, B. (2009, 29 Aug). Location, Location, Location. *Twitter Blog* Retrieved 1 Oct 2009, from <http://blog.twitter.com/2009/08/location-location-location.html>.
- Surowiecki, J. (2005). *The wisdom of crowds: why the many are smarter than the few*. London: Abacus.
- Tedeschi, B. (2007, 29 Oct). Travel Sales Still Growing, but Numbers of Customers Are Declining. *New York Times*. Retrieved 8 Oct 2009, from [http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/29/technology/29ecom.html?\\_r=3](http://www.nytimes.com/2007/10/29/technology/29ecom.html?_r=3).
- Tham, D. C. (1999). *Singaporean Journalism: The Straits Times and others, They Are A-Changin'*. Unpublished Honours, Murdoch University, Perth, Western Australia.
- twitter.com -Traffic Details from Alexa. (2009, 02 Oct). *Alexa.com* Retrieved 2 Oct 2009, from <http://www.alexa.com/siteinfo/twitter.com>.
- Van Dijk, J. A. G. M. (2006). *The Network Society: Social Aspects of New Media* (L. Spooenberg, Trans. 2nd ed.). London; Thousand Oaks; New Delhi: Sage.
- Vijayarathy, L. R., & Jones, J. M. (2000). Print and Internet catalog shopping: assessing attitudes and intentions. *Internet Research*, 10(3), 191–202.
- Wasik, B. (2006). My Crowd, or, Phase 5: A report from the inventor of the flash mob. [Subscription]. *Harper's Magazine*, 312(1870), 56–66.
- Watts, D. J. (2003). *Small worlds: the dynamics of networks between order and randomness* (illustrated ed.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Wauters, R. (2009, 28 Sep). Dopplr confirms being acquired by Nokia, says nothing will change (for now). *TechCrunch Europe* Retrieved 8 Oct 2009, from <http://uk.techcrunch.com/2009/09/28/dopplr-confirms-being-acquired-by-nokia-says-nothing-will-change-for-now/>.
- Wenger, E., McDermott, R. A., & Snyder, W. M. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice: a guide to managing knowledge*. Boston, Mass.: Harvard Business School Press.
- West, A. (2007, 20 Aug 2007). Facebook labelled a \$5b waste of time. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. Retrieved 10 Sep 2007, from <http://www.smh.com.au/articles/2007/08/19/1187462087940.html>.
- Williams, A. (2006). Tourism and hospitality marketing: fantasy, feeling and fun. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 18(6), 482–495.
- Winn, P. (2009, 21 Aug). State of the Blogosphere 2008: Introduction. *Technorati's State of the Blogosphere* Retrieved 8 Nov 2009, from <http://technorati.com/state-of-the-blogosphere/>.
- Winston, B. (1998). *Media Technology And Society — A History: From The Telegraph To The Internet*. London and New York: Routledge.

- Wittgenstein, L. (1967). *Philosophische Untersuchungen. English & German* (G. E. M. Anscombe, Trans. 3rd. ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Zittrain, J. (2006). *The Generative Internet*. Unpublished Working paper. Berkman Center Research Publication No 2006/1.
- Zittrain, J. (2008). *The Future of the Internet — And How to Stop It*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

# communications policy & research forum

## program 2009

DAY 1: Thursday, 19 November 2009

09:00 to 09:30 registration

09:30 to 10:30 **keynote address** by **Kim Williams**, CEO, FOXTEL

The rise of the digital economy: profound effects for consumers, producers, current business models and media policy

10:30 to 11:00 coffee

11:00 to 12:30 **session 1**

### 1A. Comms law: changes and consequences

(chair: Lesley Osborne)

**Rob Nicholls:** Capital punishment: regulatory reforms in commercial TV broadcasting

**Yudhistira Nugraha & William Tibben:** Strategies for a convergent ICT regulator in Indonesia\*

**Rob Nicholls & Michelle Rowland:** Telecommunications interception policy as embedded liberalism

12:30 to 13:45 lunch

13:45 to 15:15 **session 2**

### 2A. Users and access

(chair: Lesley Osborne)

**Tony Bennetts:** Access for everyone: captioned phones and VRS

**Pam Coutts:** Digital divide & access for older people

**Scott Hollier:** Accessibility and the cloud: online collaboration

15:15 to 15:45 coffee

15:45 to 17:15 **session 3**

### 3A. Changing consumer behaviour: implications for regulation

(ACMA research panel; chair: Trevor Barr)

Sharing ACMA research on changes in behaviour in a multi-service environment

**Paul Nicholas:** substitution & dependency in telecoms

**Lesley Osborne:** barriers to the effective use of digital media and communications

**Rosalie O'Neale:** cybersafety & social networking

17:15 to 18:30 drinks

### 1B. A broadband revolution?

(chair: Mark Balnaves)

**Reg Coutts:** National broadband network - a way forward

**Peter Adams:** Do Australian broadband households feel the need for speed?\*

**Michelle Rowland:** Universal broadband in an NBN nation

### 2B. NBN: making it happen

(Baker & McKenzie panel; convenor James Halliday)

Key aspects of implementing the NBN: technical, commercial and legal considerations

**Linh Tran:** Overview of implementation issues

**Stephen Wright:** NBN Co, build or buy decisions

**James Halliday:** Consequences for competition

### 3B. New Internet experiences

(chair: Michael Gordon-Smith)

**Mandy Salomon:** The immersive Internet: new models and lead users in Australia\*

**Tanya Nitins & Christy Collis:** Down to earth Internet: emerging spaces of locative media\*

**Akshay Shanker:** Tension in the economics of networks: competition, cooperation & standards

### 1C. Media representation & knowledge mgmt

(Univ of Canberra, News Research Group panel; chair Franco Papandrea)

**Kate Holland, Warwick Blood & Samantha**

**Thomas:** Consuming children - junk food ad bans\*

**Stuart Ferguson & Sally Burford:** Policies, standards & frameworks for managing knowledge\*

**Julian Thomas & Liza Hopkins:** YouthWorx - social inclusion through digital inclusion

### 2C. New media in practice

(chair: Christina Spurgeon)

**Lee Duffield, Amelia Birnie & Daniel Challis:** The growth of online publishing\*

**Terry Flew:** Democracy, participation and convergence case studies

**Yvonne Gora:** ICT and levels of togetherness in households

### 3C. What the rest of the world is doing

(chair: Reg Coutts)

**Rod Tiffen:** Towards a comparative analysis of Australian media

**Catherine Middleton:** Comparison of local versus national models for open access broadband

\* Refereed paper

# communications policy & research forum

## program 2009

DAY 2: Friday, 20 November 2009

09:00 to 10:00 **keynote address** by **Rosemary Sinclair**, Chair INTUG and Managing Director, ATUG

2018 A Cyberspace Odyssey: how we can navigate through all the obstacles to a flourishing national broadband network

10:00 to 11:00 **session 4**

### 4A. TV and radio platforms: innovation and audiences

(chair: Mark Armstrong)

**Trevor Barr:** IPTV: glimmers of hope\*

**Margaret Cupitt:** News and current affairs: delivery platforms and audiences

11:00 to 11:30 coffee

11:30 to 13:00 **session 5**

### 5A. What will Australian TV and society look like in 2018?

(TV Futures Research Group panel; convenor Ben Goldsmith)

**Philip Bell & Ben Goldsmith:** The 'outside the box' project

**Hugh Pattinson & Ben Goldsmith:** Scenario generation methodologies

**Philip Bell & Annmarie Chandler:** 2018 TV scenarios

13:00 to 14:00 lunch

14:00 to 15:30 **session 6**

### 6A. Audiences

(chair: Debra Richards)

**Jock Given & Marion McCutcheon:** Broadcasting: turning audiences into consumers\*

**Mark Balnaves & Tom O'Regan:** Survey wars: the explosion of measurements\*

**Diana Nujic:** Digital custodianship: pathways to reform

15:30 to 15:40 short break

15:40 to 16:40 **session 7**

### 7A. Digital TV Switchover

(chair: Debra Richards)

**Paul Vincent:** The box in the corner

**Franco Papandrea:** 2013 DTV switchover: a fading hope?\*

### 4B. Spectrum efficiency

(chair: Franco Papandrea)

**Denis Mullane:** Encouraging efficient use of licenced spectrum

**Ben Freyons:** Australian radiocommunications licences: minding the gaps(s)\*

### 5B. The digital economy: pathways to reform

(chair: Franco Papandrea)

**Peter Gerrard:** Domain name policy reform; recognition of Internet communities

**Terry Flew, Christina Spurgeon & Anna Daniel:** User intentions and digital media\*

**Supriya Singh, Sheila Bellamy & others:** Online financial aggregation programs: privacy and security\*

### 6B. The digital economy: new and better ways

(chair: Julian Thomas)

**Peter Leonard:** Internet marketing: new avenues and policy issues

**Scott Rickard:** Rethinking gatekeeping for UGC: conundrums\*

**Omar Khalifa:** Delivering a social dividend via online community networks

### 7B. Quality of service by telcos and ISPs

(chair: Peter Leonard)

**David Havyatt:** Perceptions of a quality service provider

**Elaine Lally & David Rowe:** Impossible choices: complexity and dissatisfaction\*

### 4C. Intellectual property

(chair: Terry Flew)

**Brett Hutchins & David Rowe:** Enraged bulls: sporting rights and digital media\*

**Robin Wright & Andrew Kenyon:** Copyright agreement in the cultural sector

### 5C. Online changes to music, apps and travel

(chair: Andrew Kenyon)

**Gerard Goggin & Jennifer Marshall:** Mobile media arbiters in the iPhone era

**Kylie Ryan:** Long tail to the top: pop music & recognition

**David Thom:** Generative audiences: social networking impacts on music and travel\*

### 6C. Strategies for new media platforms

(Smart Services CRC panel; convenor Annette Dockerty)

**Alex Burns & Barry Saunders:** Journalists as investigators and 'quality media' reputation\*

**Alex Burns & Ben Eltham:** Twitter free Iran: information & public diplomacy in the 2009 election

**George Wright:** Whatever happened to the paper boy?

### 7C. Media ethics: influence and truth

(chair: Andrew Kenyon)

**Collette Snowden:** Catastrophe and truth in news media

For more details of the forum see <http://www.networkinsight.org>