

# Assignment #1

---

**Title:**

*Conference Paper Final*

**Name:** Mary Stacy Megan Balthazar  
**Student Number:** 18915257  
**Unit Name:** Social Media, Communities & Networks  
**Email Address:** [stabal\\_95@hotmail.com](mailto:stabal_95@hotmail.com)  
**Date Submitted:** 07/05/18  
**Word Count:** 2674

I declare that I have retained a copy of this assignment. I have read and understood Curtin University policies on Plagiarism and Copyright and declare that this assignment complies with these policies. I declare that this assignment is my own work and has not been submitted previously in any form for assessment.

\_\_\_\_\_ S.B \_\_\_\_\_

(Date/Signature)

(Typing your name in the space provided is sufficient when submitting online via FLECS-Blackboard.)

## **Web 2.0 is having a great impact on forging youth identity through participatory culture**

### **Abstract**

Online participatory culture is currently gaining more attention within the youth generation creating their own identity. This conference paper draws the benefits of the web 2.0 on participatory learning. It has been analyzed that through the affinity space, youth is more involved in sharing their knowledge and upgrading them through feedbacks. Youth are becoming more mature while going beyond the aspect of culture, race and ethnicity. The web 2.0 offers low barrier compared to real life where youth are faced with more differences which stop them to a certain point. A specific platform has been chosen to explain the methodological and public structures being provided to creation of participatory culture. Five main characteristics are being explained so as to understand the youth identity creation through YouTube.

### **Introduction**

The Internet is rapidly turning into an essential piece of life. The inserted part of the Internet in regular daily existence is maybe most common for youth than anyone else (Raynes-Goldie & Walker, 2008.) Studies have shown that a lot of youth, almost three quarter of the American population have access to the internet and that half of the latter number, go online in an everyday basis. Individuals construct their personality through the ceaseless look for acknowledgment according to others and this has a greater impact on youth as they are still searching and creating their identities. The social investigation of character part depends on the trading of individual preparations communicating different parts of the person's characteristics, capabilities or exercises (Cardon & Aguiton, 2007). This is where participatory culture enters the game. Participatory culture moves the focal point of education from one of person articulation to group involvement. The new proficiencies all include social abilities created through joint effort and systems administration. The one who is stating that the internet has only negative consequences on youth is wrong. Participatory culture is the proof of contradiction to that previous statement as it helps in both learning more and creating identities.

### **Affinity space**

According to James Paul Gee (Gee, 2005), affinity space “is a particularly important contemporary social configuration with implications for the future of schools and schooling.” It is a given that if youth has no entrance to class, they will be closed out of basic chances to learn, collaborate with peers, and build up their identity. Nowadays, people may say the same regarding youth who have no entrance to electronic liking spaces. Progressively, it is by connection and investigating such spaces that youngsters seek after their interests, characterize who they need to be, and create vital information and abilities. Not exclusively does energy tend to bring forth new associations between existing liking spaces as youths recognize new joins, it additionally empowers the creation of new youth produced spaces. This reception, adaption and expansion of spaces makes a dynamic biological community that reflects shared enthusiasm at any one time. As spaces of spaces, proclivity spaces are rich conveyed instructing what's more, realizing frameworks (Goldman & Booker, 2008). The individuals who invest the greater part of their learning energy in the classroom, without likewise having opportunities to

wander among a heap of virtual destinations and their related areas, will be enormously distraught. Casual learning is either premium driven or companion driven, thus person to person communication destinations are referred to as encouraging numerous constructive instructive learning possibilities, for example, shared learning, enhancement of social articulation, aptitude improvement for the advanced working environment, a more engaged feeling of citizenship, synchronous and offbeat criticism, and the capacity to expand social settings, for example, school, college, or nearby group. In that capacity the conversational, synergistic, and group like characteristics of long range interpersonal communication locales are in arrangement with what we know to be great models of learning, in that they are collective and empower participatory part for youth. Long range interpersonal communication destinations can likewise bolster collaborations and trades between students confronting comparative difficulties in their examinations; interface students with other people who have common affinities not considered in their quick instructive situations. Youngsters are taking part in these exercises as people as well as frequently cooperatively and helpfully as intrigue or reason driven gatherings (Greenhow, Robelia, & Hughes, 2009).

Normally identities are created through institutions like schools, religions, family, community and so on. However, nowadays youth are exposed to the internet which can help in the creation of their identities. Online communities can permit them to create the same peer to peer affiliations for example as they could have had in schools. Youth themselves argues that the web 2.0 is more 'creative', 'media-oriented' and 'interactive' than the way it is at school (Greenhow & Robelia, 2009). Participatory culture exposes youth to people all around the world. Everyone is free to join, subscribe, invite and so on. Via web 2.0 it is easier to be part of a community without knowing anyone than forming part of a community in the real life. Online communities go beyond race, cultures or backgrounds. Being part of online communities help youth to create their anti-biased identity (Hou, Komlodi, Lutters, Hercegfi, & J, 2015). Affinity space has enable youth to chose by themselves wherever they want to belong. There is no kind of pressure, they keep moving at their own rhythm. Through participatory culture, they don't feel a face to face rejection. Youth are susceptible to remarks, however online, they take it differently. As they are choosing their group, it more acceptable to them as everyone is participating at the same level, everyone is being corrected, everyone is bringing their own part as for a wiki for example. Everyone is a learner, and everyone is bringing new stuff so as to inform other of their knowledge (Luckin & Weatherby, 2012). Moreover, it can be said that youth build their identity through the nonstop scan for acknowledgment according to others (Aguiton & Cardon, 2007).

### **The common culture**

Social networking sites enable to create communities, form groups so that everyone can help others (Greenhow, 2011). Nowadays schools are very interactive within the internet, this is the revolution and "knowledge creation are fast becoming the most important sources of new material and intellectual wealth." This thought of a learning environment specifies that: 1) young people are all the while associated with numerous situations; 2) they make learning settings for themselves inside furthermore, crosswise over situations; 3) the bounds between situations can be porous; and 4) intrigue ambitious exercises may traverse logical limits and act naturally managing given sufficient time, opportunity what's more, assets (Greenhow, 2011). Sharing information through social media had become easier than before, conversations are more frequent with the simple way of creating a group conversation, send a message or simply calling. Another tie is made between the hubs when a someone locks himself in any

movement. Hence, behind every sole act, there is a kind of social relationship development (Kanagavel & Velayutham, 2010). The participatory culture helps in any sense, for example, people from small countries are up to date. They stay focus on YouTube or Facebook, where they follow celebrities, and this create their identity, upon their way of dressing, what music they listen to and so on. Groups are created, and they create a sense of belonging whatever the group they join. SNS is at the core of its prevalence, overwhelming the common culture of urban youngsters around the world. The boundaries on the net are very limited, for example while joining a group, everyone is just helping each other through commenting without caring about gender, social class or religion. Generally fascinating were those instances of understudies purposefully utilizing Myspace for example to illuminate and feature their interests and capacities. They put forward their willingness of doing something of their life, they put forward their interest. This can be a good thing for the future while looking for a job, this will be helpful as nowadays even directors when doing an interview, can go on your profile and can see what your interest or what kind of person you are. Understudies likewise utilized SNSs to satisfy basic social learning works inside and crosswise over casual and formal learning circles of movement. These common learning capacities included acquiring approval and gratefulness inventive effort through criticism on their profile pages; peer/graduated class bolster, that is, connecting with previous schoolmates to give or get help in dealing with the good and bad times of school life; and assistance with school-related errands. The last mentioned took a few structures: "chatting" through Facebook to moderate school-related pressure, inquiring inquiries concerning guidelines or due dates, arranging study gatherings, asking for instructive assets from the system, assembling venture materials, conceptualizing thoughts, sharing composed work, and trading input. Strikingly, members imagined utilizing an informal organization site as a feature of their school progress system also, felt their standard utilization of interpersonal interaction locales were building up their inventiveness, correspondence aptitudes, innovation abilities, and receptiveness to dissimilar perspectives. Extra engaged research is required to decide the exactness of these discernment (Greenhow, 2011).

Moreover, being active for youth is quite like a game. With the increase of accessibility of the internet, being active online is way easy. With their smartphones, tablets or laptops, youth can have access to internet at any moment of the day, wherever they are and so on. Putting on to their settings if ever to get notifications to whatever online communities they are, notifications about updates, if someone commented or anything else can be immediate with the access of internet everywhere. Youth are in a constant movement with their smartphones which allow them to be quickly updates. This keeps them curious and at the same way motivated to see what is going on on their online community. This is a way to attract and retrain youth to their community (Ransbotham & C., 2011). And as they choose their specific community, this means that there is a stable gathering of members who can create encounter working together adequately, create shared standards and rules, and concede to a typical vision for the group. This mutual experience may enable the group to work relentlessly toward which create the will of the youth (Ransbotham & C., 2011).

### **Two-way advancement**

If YouTube is taken as an example, it is known as being the more use video-sharing website around the world (Chau, 2011). It is more than just a video web site sharing though, its exceptional settings such as the methodological and public structures provide the creation of participatory culture. Those features help a lot to the youth generation. Established in media

ponders, the standard of participatory culture structure is significant to youth advancement analysts since it gives a focal point to comprehend specific mechanisms that pull in youth to work together and deliver innovative, self-expressive, and self-started media items (Chau, 2011). YouTube has five main characteristics that helps in the development of youth identity: 1) little barricades to creative expressions, 2) solid support for creating and sharing, 3) informal mentorship, 4) a confidence that contributions matter and finally 5) social connections. YouTube allows youth to not being fully part of the community in the sense that signing up is not necessary. Youth may just consumer whatever is on YouTube, read comment but however not posting anything. These young client encounters show a far-reaching trajectory with moderately low hindrances. Such low obstructions manage the cost of simple section into the group and honest to goodness commitment even at the fringe. Youth increase new abilities and investigate their way of life as they explore the group and take an interest in its exercises. They are just using this platform to inform themselves in a first step and afterwards shift in a more contributing audience and signing up so that they can themselves start posting stuffs. In this transaction from the first step to the second step, youth found the need to be a more contributing among the society.

Moreover, through researches, creating and sharing content has become an easy thing for the youth community of YouTube. By making content sharing simple and part of the collective talk, stages, for example, YouTube organize their individuals' feeling of having a place and identification with the group and, consequently, devotion to the stage. YouTube offers a variety of topics from which youth can learn other than learning them from different institutions, cooking for example and so many other things. It gives chances to youth to go up against various duties. This kind of learning is increasing on other media groups also. A way of communication in participatory is by getting feedback. Feedbacks are good way to involve in whatever circumstances. Commenting and grading videos are common on YouTube and mostly among the youth community. This is a good process rising the self-esteem of anyone, thus good comments are always a helping way for youth to be innovative and come back with more videos. YouTube is different from other social networking sites. This investigation has plan suggestions for different spaces that draw in youth media makers. It shows how participatory culture welcomes and inspires youth makers. As communicate and specialized Web entries are starting to converge with interpersonal interaction Web locales, it is vital to ponder how creative spaces can use Web 2.0 innovations to make a sociotechnical participatory culture in which individuals feel enabled to connect with and take an interest (Chau, 2011).

## **Conclusion**

To conclude, this conference paper has been written down to put forward different positive aspects which has enable the youth community to construct an identity within the participatory culture. From affinity spaces to a brief discussion of social networking sites to YouTube, web 2.0 has permitted multiple sense that were not obviously possible in the real life. Other than institutions which can help them, youngers must be adventurous and explore their own interests and passion and the web 2.0 has allowed them to do this. There is a sense a freeness within all this big world of the web 2.0 is that you are free to choose. Youngsters are free to choose, they can first explore and then wherever they feel a kind of attachment, they can enter the community. This is a very good thing as there is no kind of pressure, they can move forward at their own speed range. Everyone is just sharing their knowledge and they are also getting feedback and learning from other's knowledge as well. Thus, web 2.0 is having a great impact

in participatory culture helping youth to create their own identity other than passing through original institutions.

# References

- Aguiton, C., & Cardon, D. (2007). The Strength of Weak Cooperation: An Attempt to Understand the Meaning of Web 2.0. *Communications & Strategies*, Vol. 65, pp. 51-65.
- Cardon, D., & Aguiton, C. (2007). The Strength of Weak Cooperation: An Attempt to Understand the Meaning of Web 2.0. *Communications & Strategies*, Vol. 65, pp. 51-65.
- Chau, C. (2011). YouTube as a participatory culture. *Special Issue: New Media and Technology: Youth as Content Creators*, vol 2010, No,128 , pp65-74.
- Gee, J. P. (2005). Semiotic Social Spaces and Affinity Spaces Semiotic Social Spaces and Affinity Spaces: From The Age of Mythology to Today's Schools. In D. T. In Barton, *Beyond Communities of Practice: Language Power and Social Context* (pp. 214-232). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Gee, J. P. (2017). Identity and diversity in today's world. *Multicultural Education Review*, VOL. 9, NO. 2, 83–92.
- Goldman, S., & Booker, A. (2008). Mixing the Digital, Social, and Cultural: Learning, Identity, and Agency. *Youth, Identity, and Digital Media.*, 185–206.
- Greenhow, C. (2011). Online Social Networking and Learning: What are the Interesting Research Questions? *International Journal of Cyber Behavior. Psychology and Learning*, 36-50.
- Greenhow, C., & Robelia, B. (2009). Informal learning and identity formation in online. *Learning, Media and Technology*, Vol 34, Issue 2, pp 119-140.
- Greenhow, C., Robelia, B., & Hughes, J. E. (2009). Learning, Teaching, and Scholarship in a Digital Age. *Web 2.0 and Classroom Research: What Path Should We Take Now?*, Vol 38, Issue 4, pp 246-259.
- Hou, W., Komlodi, A., Lutters, W., Hercegf, K., & J, J. (2015). Supporting children's online identity in international communities. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, Vol 34, no 4, pp 375-391.
- Kanagavel, R., & Velayutham, C. (2010). Impact of Social Networking on College Students: A Comparative Study in India and the Netherlands. *International Journal of Virtual Communities and Social Networking*, 55-67.
- Luckin, R., & Weatherby, K. (2012). Online learning communities in context . *Web Based Communities*, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp 440-454.
- Ransbotham, S., & C., G. (2011). Membership Turnover and Collaboration Success in Online Communities: Explaining Rises and Falls from Grace in Wikipedia. *MIS Quarterly*, Vol. 35, No. 3, pp. 613-627.
- Raynes-Goldie, K., & Walker, L. (2008.). Our Space: Online Civic Engagement Tools for Youth. *Civic Life Online: Learning How Digital Media Can Engage Youth.*, 161–188.