

8-2016

Social Learning Remixed: Peer-Based Learning and Social Status in an Online Community of Practice

Christopher Erin Mikkelson
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Interpersonal and Small Group Communication Commons](#), and the [Online and Distance Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mikkelson, Christopher Erin, "Social Learning Remixed: Peer-Based Learning and Social Status in an Online Community of Practice" (2016). *Theses and Dissertations*. 1648.
<http://scholarworks.uark.edu/etd/1648>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact scholar@uark.edu, ccmiddle@uark.edu.

Social Learning Remixed: Peer-Based Learning and Social Status in an Online
Community of Practice

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts in Communication

by

Christopher Mikkelson
University of Arkansas
Bachelor of Arts in Communication, 2013

August 2016
University of Arkansas

This thesis is approved for recommendation to the Graduate Council.

Dr. Ron Warren
Thesis Director

Dr. Kasey Walker
Committee Member

Dr. Trish Amason
Committee Member

Abstract

People have engaged in peer-to-peer learning within communities of practice (CoPs) for centuries. Thanks to web 2.0 technology, people in the 21st century can now learn together and enact social status even if they have never met face-to-face. Online communities of practice have since formed around a wide variety of activities, one of which is remixing. Remixing is defined as combining or editing existing materials to produce something new, but leaving each part recognizable as a separate entity. Remixing has recently been recognized as form of digital literacy because users must understand each component to make a good remix. Much has been written about remixing, but no studies have used CoP theory to study peer-to-peer learning and social status within a community of practice focused on remixing. This study seeks to fill that void by studying the online community AMV.org. The first key finding is that user responsibility (or lack thereof) is an important part of either facilitating or inhibiting peer-to-peer learning in this community. The second key finding is that integrating new users into the community is an important part of peer-to-peer learning in this community. The third finding centers on AMV.org's unique attributes as a CoP focused on the practice of remixing and these attributes' facilitation of peer-to-peer learning.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank: Dr. Ron Warren, for being a steadfast mentor and advisor. Dr. Kasey Walker, for helping with the methods section, and giving me the opportunity to write a lit review where I got the idea for this thesis. Dr. Trish Amason, for being on my committee, and being excited about the project. Dr. Stephanie Schulte, for kindling my love of studying online communities. Dr. Robert Wicks, for allowing me to write a thesis prospectus in his media class. Cliff Mikkelson (aka, dad), for putting up with my late nights and early mornings as I worked on this thesis. Patricia Mikkelson (aka, mom), for being passionate about community and inspiring me to become interested in it as well. Mahriyanna Kerbergan, for being willing to listen to my frustrations and successes. Robert Kersbergan for helping to inspire my love of technology. Aaron Ciocco for helping me identify errors in this thesis by reading it aloud to me. My bandmates in The Flight to Light, for giving me grace when I had major deadlines. All my friends, for sticking by me even when I was at home hammering away at the keyboard.

Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction and Review of Literature	1
Communities of Practice	5
Social Status in CoPs	9
Remixing Groups as a CoP	18
Rationale	19
Chapter 2: Method	22
AMV.org as an Online Community	22
The AMV.org Website	25
Data Collection and Sampling	26
Data Analysis	29
Ethics	31
Chapter 3: Mutual Engagement, Joint Enterprise, and Shared Repertoire	34
Mutual Engagement	34
Joint Enterprise	40
Shared Repertoire	48
Summary	56
Chapter 4: Social Status on AMV.org	58
Lurking and Peripherality	58
Norms	62
Identity as Social Status	66
Institutional Social Status	70
Summary	77

Chapter 5: Conclusion.....	79
References.....	84
Endnotes.....	90
Appendix A: Figures.....	91
Appendix B: Coding Scheme.....	99
Appendix C: IRB Approval	101

Chapter 1: Introduction and Review of Literature

If someone from the twenty-first century went back in time to 1983 and asked media theorist Ithiel de Sola Pool to accurately forecast the media landscape of today, they might ask if he was a time traveler. Pool (1983) foresaw the internet before it became the thriving cyberspace it is today; and although he did not call them by name, he saw email and video conferencing services such as Skype coming down the road. He seemed to gaze into the future and see that delivering money, news, manuscripts, scientific data, and even an education would be just a mouse click away. Digital technology has changed how people learn and create together. People from across the world can interact, give feedback, and work on projects without ever being in the same room or even talking on the telephone.

If one went even further back in time to 1962 and asked futurist Marshall McLuhan to describe his vision of modern media, they would hear ideas about how new technology would allow the ordinary citizen to become their own media producers. Flash forward to the twenty first century; his dream became a reality much faster than he thought it would (Dizard, 2000). Media sharing websites such as WordPress, Blogger, YouTube, and Pinterest (to name a few), combined with camera enabled smart phones and easy to use editing software, enable almost anyone to be a content producer (Knobel, Lankshear, & Lewis, 2010). However, just because users have the potential to produce media does not mean they will create quality content. Anyone with a YouTube channel can upload a video, and anyone with a WordPress blog can post an entry, but who checks the content for errors? Who suggests changes to improve these creative endeavors, and make them the best they can be? Who motivates users to keep coming up with creative content? The answer in the 21st century is a community consisting of like minded peers.

Peer-to-peer learning “can most appropriately be viewed as an umbrella term used to describe a range of interventions where the educators and the educated are seen to share something that creates an affinity between them” (Shiner, 1999, p. 564). This could include age, ethnicity, gender, an experience, or social class. The phenomenon of peer-to-peer learning in communities is centuries old, but Lave and Wenger (1991) were the first ones to use the term “community of practice” (CoP) to describe group learning through shared activity. CoP was later expanded by Wenger (1998), who organized the concepts into a theoretical framework; Wenger, McDermott, and Snyder (2002), who discussed CoP theory in regards to learning within a company; and Wenger and Trayner, (2015), who brought CoP theory into the 21st century by discussing online CoPs.

Communal learning is rooted within our very nature as social beings. Take, for example, early humans working together as a tribe to teach each other how to hunt or learning which plants to eat and which to avoid (Wenger, 1998). Picture the impressionists of the 19th century inventing art together. They would meet in cafes and studios to discuss new styles and share best practices; and although they painted individually, they gained valuable skills and insights from interactions with their peers (Wenger & Trayner, 2015). The advent of high speed internet and other digital technology has fundamentally changed how people learn together as they can now be part of a learning community without being anywhere near each other (Waldron, 2009). It has also changed how people enact social status within communities. The concept of peer-to-peer learning conveys the idea that everyone is on the same level, though not everyone is equally experienced. While there are no official teachers, there are members of the community who have more or less social status depending how they are situated within the community. Thus, members

with more social status become teachers and guides within the community. In addition, online CoPs have structural features that enable or inhibit social status, as well as offering new ways for members to display it.

Studying online CoPs as a place of informal, peer-to-peer learning is a relatively new field, yet it has already garnered plenty interest from scholars. There are authors who have used communities of practice as a framework to investigate areas such as formal, global communities (Hendrix, 2008), nursing and midwifery (Thomas, Fried, Johnson, & Stilwell, 2010), Q&A websites (Rosenbaum & Shachaf, 2010), and music composition (Waldron, 2009). The number of blogs, forums and wikis on the internet is in the hundred millions, and is growing every day. So if someone has a specific interest, it is very likely there will be others who share that interest as well and might have even built an online community around that interest (Kozinets, 2015). One such area of interest that has gained popularity is remixing, and there are multiple online communities that have been created to facilitate this activity (such as animemusicvideos.org, overclockedremix.com, and harrypotterfanfiction.com). Remixing is the “process by which students learn by taking culture apart and putting it back together.” As opposed to beginning with a blank canvas, the video, literary work, or song “emerges through the artist’s engagement with previous cultural materials. Artists build on, are inspired by, appropriate, and transform other artists’ work” (Jenkins, Clinton, Purushatma, Robison, & Weigel, 2006, p. 55). For example, someone might take a piece of music from a video game, change the genre and song structure, and incorporate a new melody part they wrote themselves. This creation is both new and old at the same time. It should still be recognizable as music from the video game, but it should also be fundamentally altered in such a way that it is considered a new creation.

Many authors have studied remixing (e.g., Ito et al., 2010; Jenkins et al., 2006; Stedman, 2012; Navas, Gallagher, & Burrough, 2014), however, there are no studies that use CoP theory to study informal learning within an online community focused on remixing. Authors such as Ito et al. (2010) and Stedman (2012) mentioned findings akin to the learning concepts outlined in CoP, but do not use it as a framework. The literature reveals that learning takes place in different ways depending on the community and its particular practice. So it is worthwhile to explore how learning is enacted in a variety of communities. In addition, there has been interest in how social status is ascribed in communities of practice, though once again there are different ways of ascribing social status depending on the community. To address these gaps, this thesis explores how CoP theory can provide a framework to examine peer-to-peer learning and social status in an online community of practice (in this case, one focused on remixing). This study uses a qualitative method called Netnography (Kozinets, 2010; Kozinets, Dobec, & Earley, 2014; Kozinets 2015), which involves the researcher being part of an online community, collecting data from conversation threads and observing learning while it occurs. The online community chosen for this study is animemusicvideos.org (AMV.org). Members in this community create music videos by splicing and arranging existing footage from Japanese animation (Anime) so it goes along with the style, rhythm, and emotion of a chosen song.

This study is divided into five parts. Chapter One outlines the key concepts of CoP theory. Chapter Two gives an overview of AMV.org and explores the key components of how a Netnography is conducted; including entering the community, data collection, and data analysis. Chapters Three and Four look in depth at the results and discussion of findings. Chapter Five summarizes the study's key findings, limitations, and implications for future research.

Communities of Practice

CoP is both a way to describe actual learning communities and a theory of communal learning. CoP theory is based in situated cognition (Lave & Wenger, 1991), an environmental theory of informal learning which positions learning as occurring through a person's interaction and participation with a culture. A CoP refers to a group “of people who share a concern or a passion for something they do and learn how to do it better as they interact regularly” (Wenger & Trayner, 2015, p. 1). There are online CoPs and offline CoPs, as well as CoPs that operate both online and offline simultaneously (see Waldron, 2009). Some CoPs are created by an organization, others are more open and informal (Hara, Shachaf, & Stoerger, 2009). Studying informal online CoPs is increasingly popular among researchers because the learning is situated within a social context, but happens without formal teachers and structured lessons (Evans, Yeung, Markoulakis, & Guilcher, 2014). Although informal and peer driven, CoPs are an effective learning environment for many different areas of practice. As a result, researchers have theorized about how CoPs can be cultivated and encouraged (Wenger et al., 2002).

Wenger (1998) emphasized four elements that are essential to a CoP: meaning, identity, practice, and community. Wenger and Trayner (2015) have since combined meaning and identity into the concept of domain. The domain is the area of interest that keeps the community together, and is what “creates common ground and a sense of common identity... [and also] inspires members to contribute and participate and gives meaning to their actions” (Wenger et al., 2002, p. 28-29). Membership in these communities implies a certain level of commitment to the focus of the group and gives users a shared identity that “distinguishes members from other people” (Wenger & Trayner, 2015, p. 2). The domain can involve everyone being in similar profession,

having the same role in a company, dealing with the same problems, having similar interests, etc. The domain changes because the members' understanding of it evolves over time, but identity and meaning hold it together. In the world of web designers, for example, computer languages are continually updated, so designers must adapt this into their understanding of the domain. While the domain might shift, their identity is still rooted in the practice of web design and their shared meaning of what it is to be web designer (Wenger et al., 2002).

Community and practice are the ways to describe the interactions and enterprises of the group. Without interactions, learning is a solitary affair and communal learning cannot take place. Wenger and Trayner (2015) make it clear that just calling a group of people a community does not mean they are a CoP. For example, a neighborhood can be considered a community, but it is not usually one that necessarily interacts or shares a practice. In the same vein; a practice is not always carried out within a community (e.g., practicing scales on a piano is a practice, but it is not a community). CoPs are set apart because “members of the community of practice are practitioners. They develop a shared repertoire of resources: [such as] experiences, stories, tools, ways of addressing recurring problems—in short a shared practice” (Wenger & Trayner, 2015, p. 2). Three communication behaviors occur that build community and help members hone their practice: mutual engagement, joint enterprise, and a shared repertoire.

Mutual Engagement. Wenger (1998) defined mutual engagement as individuals learning about the community and engaging in the practice along side other members. Evans et al. (2014) emphasized how a diverse membership enables the community to learn from each other. The researchers found that mutual engagement involved members sharing knowledge and challenging each other's ideas. They found that when a question was posed by a member of the

group, users helped by researching the answer. Rosenbaum and Shachaf (2010) also found that mutual engagement involved members working together to answer questions. New participants were welcomed to contribute, but there was a core group that answered a majority of questions and were more involved in mutual engagement. As part of their Q&A, members might share personal stories. For example, a member might give background information to set up a question so potential respondents can better understand the situation. Subsequently, the member who answers the question might tell a story to show how they handled a similar problem (Paechter, 2012).

Joint enterprise. Joint enterprise is a “negotiation toward a shared understanding of the nature and purpose of the community’s activities” (Rosenbaum & Shachaf, 2010, p. 1939). An example of joint enterprise is found in Evans et al.’s (2014) study of physiotherapists working to build a collective body of knowledge. These users examined new information using their specific expertise and helped each other use it in practice. In Rosenbaum and Shachaf’s (2010) study of Yahoo Answers, Wikipedia, and Answerbag. The researchers discovered that users constantly reevaluated and discussed the goals of the Wikipedia reference desk (a part of the site where the guidelines for question and answers were posted). There was a continuous ebb and flow of negotiation as users decided what was considered “off-topic and on-topic, as well as how to answer questions” (p. 1939).

Accountability is also an important part of the joint enterprise. This involves members answering new posts and keeping the conversations flowing without relying on moderators to do so (Paechter, 2012). As a result, members might be more likely to work together in the fight to keep unconstructive and negative comments (or flaming) to a minimum (Rosenbaum & Shachaf,

2010) and to establish an encouraging culture for members. Paechter (2012) found an example of positive culture building when one member posted, “when did this forum turn into a podium for back-stabbing and insults. Come on everyone, we are allowed to hold our opinions and voice them, but that doesn’t give us the right to disregard and insult the views of others” (p. 400). This post was an attempt to persuade members of the community to remember what the community was about and the need to stick together.

Shared Repertoire. The use of shared repertoire is essential to the peer driven learning process in CoPs. Wenger (1998) defined this concept as “renegotiating the meaning of various elements; producing or adopting tools, artifacts, representations; recording and recalling events; inventing new terms and redefining or abandoning old ones; telling and retelling stories; creating and breaking routines” (p. 95). This repertoire can take many different forms and “includes tools, routine, stories, jargon, shortcuts, or any resource that might be used over time in a shared pursuit to negotiate meaning” (Evans et al., 2014, p. 216). In online CoPs this includes shared links to external websites and resources; an understanding of seminal works and people of the practice; evidence of previous acts of mutual engagement in the form of archived questions and answers; jargon in the form of specific terms where the meaning is understood without it being explicitly stated; and inside jokes (Evans et al., 2014; Rosenbaum & Shachaf, 2010; Waldron, 2009). For example, in Paechter’s (2012) study of the divorce support website Wikivorce, she found that understanding running jokes was a sign of shared repertoire. In order to understand the jokes, a member would need to have followed the discussion. In one of the posts, a member makes references to doughnuts, cats among the pigeons, and latex gloves without any context or

explanation whatsoever. This turns into a bonding experience for the community, letting them know they are in a group who shares their thoughts and ideas.

It must be noted that these communication behaviors (mutual engagement, joint enterprise, and shared repertoire) are intertwined. For example, as new members enter a community there are new chances for mutual engagement. This might also “awaken new interests that translate into a renegotiation of the enterprise...and add new elements to the repertoire” (Wenger, 1998, p. 97). In online CoPs these communication behaviors can exist simultaneously within a single discussion thread. For example, Waldron (2009) examined a thread where one member asked the community for help with a song. Other users worked together to answer the original poster’s question (i.e., mutual engagement), while also using the thread to discuss the pros and cons of song learning (i.e., joint enterprise) and posting links to useful tools such as a software program that slows down and transposes music. In order to fully engage, users had to understand what the other members and the original poster meant when they referred to such cryptic terms as MIDI files, tablEdit, and abc notation (i.e., shared repertoire).

Social Status in CoPs

As in offline communities, members of online communities enjoy varying levels of esteem, admiration, and respect. Social status is also a key factor in learning relationships, as the learner often looks to someone with expertise for guidance. A review of the literature reveals three ways social status is gained and enacted in CoPs. One is through developing one’s place or identity in relation to other community members, another is through following and creating norms, and the last one is being given social status through institutional means.

Identity. Wenger (1998) saw social status as having to do with an individual's identity, and their power to shape the world they practice in; thus veering away from more politically and economically based definitions of classic sociological studies (e.g., Weber, 1922). Wenger (1998) saw one's identity in the community as defining an individual's social status. Members would either identify themselves as having high status because they were a full-fledged member or low in status because of less experience. Wenger et al. (2002) pointed out that identity and social status is indeed an important part of CoP because members "take on various roles, officially and unofficially. They create their own specialties and styles. They gain a reputation. They achieve status and generate their own personal sphere of influence. In other words, each member develops a unique individual identity in relation to the community" (p. 35).

Identity as a form of social status is grounded in Lave and Wenger's (1991) concept of Legitimate Peripheral Participation. This concept explains the location of the member in their social world and describes how members move from one identity to another; from being one role to becoming another. Peripherality refers to newcomers being given a chance by the more experienced users to be involved with the practice of the community. Peripherality occurs when a participant engages in the practice, learns how to do the practice, and begins to understand how the community works. Legitimacy refers to being recognized as part of the community of practice. Legitimacy happens when someone contributes something useful to the community; is already known to someone in the community; or puts themselves out there in a likable and approachable fashion. If someone is recognized as being part of the community, their mistakes are more likely to be seen as learning opportunities as opposed to reasons for being eliminated or ostracized. It must be noted that Legitimate Peripheral Participation should be taken as a whole,

not as three separate parts. There is no illegitimate peripheral participation, nor is there legitimate central participation, as that would imply complete mastery of the practice (Wenger, 1998).

Taking this into account, there are two ends of the continuum when it comes to membership. The expert "who has evolved their identity and meaning making to fit within the community" (Campbell, Veremikina, & Herrington, 2009, p. 649) and the novice who exists on the edge of the community, but is still accepted as a member of the community. Boven (2014) gave an example of members who understood that they were novices and recognized there were perceived experts on a forum who had more knowledge than they did. The "newbies" started by lurking and reading old discussion threads to get a sense of the community before asking the "experts" any questions. Online CoPs offer users the unique advantage of anonymously observing the community, or lurking. Because public conversation threads are archived and viewable, users can begin to understand the community without fear of looking foolish just because they have "nothing to offer" (Grey, 2004, p. 6). While lurking has its benefits, it might be a less satisfying experience because members do not feel like an official part of the community (Nonnecke, Andrews, & Preece, 2006). If a user wants to become more fully integrated into the community, she/he must begin to interact with other users (Shafie, Yaacob, & Singh, 2016).

Of course, CoP recognizes that no matter how much a person knows, there is always more to learn. Therefore, not only does the expert teach the novice, but the novice teaches the expert, and they both learn from others in the community (Wenger & Trayner, 2015). Learning is more than just observing and mimicking the practice; it means engaging in the practice alongside other members (Wenger, 1998). Vygotsky (1978; 1981) noted that results of interactions between

novices and "mature practitioners" was an increased skill level in the novice (Hung & Der-Thanq, 2001, p.5). He proposed that learners have a certain number of potential learning routes available to them, and that higher levels of thinking could be fostered through "social interactions with [more] knowledgeable members of the society" (Gredler, 2009, p. 337). He labeled this mentorship style the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD).

Norms. Members do not always learn directly from each other in an apprentice-master relationship. Many times it is easier for learners to find the information they need in a frequently asked question area (FAQ) or other type of record (Lin & Chiou, 2010). Though users in online communities are more respected if they are self-taught, "technically savvy peers do not always make good mentors" (Lange, 2014, p. 215). They might hold the ideal of being self-taught so high that they do not offer the level of help needed to bring new members into the community. Hence, users might gain social status by obeying the norms of the community.

There are two types of norms: explicit and implicit. Explicit norms "are [rules] codified in formal documents such as terms of use or FAQ. By laying out the purpose and rules of the community, explicit norms provide formalized expectations regarding group member behaviours and social interactions. Conversely, implicit norms are unwritten expectations regarding appropriate behavior in the online community; they emerge through interactions among its members" (Petric & Petrovic, 2014, p. 439). However, implicit norms are not always clear for new members. Goldberg and Mackness, (2009) found that implicit norms were generally understood by more actively engaged users, while newcomers (or "newbies") did not always understand them. In his study of an online CoP based on heraldry, Boven (2014) concluded that members became experts by doing research outside the community, observing, and then posting

questions on the forum. The process of becoming an expert could be very time consuming. Members were careful not to flaunt new knowledge, but instead took time to listen and learn. In part, this was because of a stigma attached to the term “expert.” No one wanted to draw attention to themselves because they might be ridiculed for breaking the implicit norm of not calling themselves an expert. As a result members would downplay their social status by saying things like “I’m not much of an expert in that, but...” (p. 258) and then go into an educated explanation. Yet in Boven’s interviews with members, they were more likely to openly identify as experts because they were not as afraid of breaking any norms.

The implicit norm of reciprocity can also be a contributing factor in ascribing social status rankings in some communities. Stewart (2005) examined an online community where members were ranked from least to most experienced by peer rankings and titles assigned to them by the website. These titles were “observer,” “apprentice,” “journeyer,” and finally “master.” Being recognized as having a higher status was a socially driven activity; users would rank individuals high or low when they saw others doing so. Reciprocity played a large part in how users were ranked. If one user rated another user highly, that user was likely to return the favor and rank them high in return. The norm of reciprocity was also apparent in Beacom, Kim, Selby, Weber, & Monge’s (2015) study of an online community called nanoHUB. The researchers used Status Characteristics Theory to examine two type of status cues (diffuse and specific). “Diffuse status cues are social categorizations such as age, ethnicity, and gender, thought to indicate an individual’s general prestige, aptitude, and social worth. Specific status cues, such as training, certifications, and professional awards, are thought to indicate expertise relevant to a task (p. 6-7). The diffuse status cues in these study were organizational rank,

occupational position, and nanoHUB membership tenure; the specific cues were tool review, tool NCN status, and tool difficulty. Of the diffuse cues, occupational position was the strongest predictor of social status because of some members identified as university faculty. Of the specific cues, tool review was strongly connected to high social status because it was connected to strong relational ties and collaboration with other members. The authors hypothesized that there might have been a core group of members who created the Nano simulation tools and in turn reviewed each other's work. In these acts of reciprocity, users helped build each other's social status.

Institutional. Davies (2005) criticized the view that social status is linked to identity as being too vague. Instead she pushed for a more structured approach, calling for CoP theory to recognize that because:

Communities do have barriers, and monitor access and admission, [it] must entail that they have an internal structure and hierarchy. If an individual is to have the right (power) to sanction another's access and admission, then that right (power) must be recognized and accepted by the majority of the community, and thus they must be considered to be towards the apex of the hierarchy" (p.576).

She described two groups within a school: burnouts and jocks. The burnouts were recognized as having social status by their peers, but to the rest of the world they were losers. On the other hand, jocks were not only recognized as having a higher social status by their peers, but society as well. The school gave them status because they had good grades, were involved in school government, and did well in sports. This gave the jocks power because they were endorsed by the institution. However, there were only so many spots on the football team or in student government, so the jocks were less likely to incorporate new members because of these limited

resources. Thus, the jocks became gatekeepers to the “inner circle” because of the power they were given by the institution.

Eckert and Wenger (2005) responded by agreeing that jocks and burnouts each have their own separate community, but that comparing the two communities might be like comparing apples to oranges. For example, burnouts embrace a more egalitarian hierarchy, while the jocks are part of an institutional hierarchy. Each group has a different way of defining power and within each group there might be smaller groups who define hierarchy depending on how they identify themselves (i.e., one group of burnouts might value how tough a person is, another group might value how street savvy a person is). The authors concluded that while power is an important part of CoP theory, it should not be used as a discovery procedure or a model on which to base all other power structures.

Moore (2006) responded to Davies’ (2005) views by emphasizing that all communities are not the same and that assuming social status is ascribed the same way in every community would prevent the researcher from discovering the unique ways it is ascribed in each community. In her study of a CoP made up of UK high school girls, she found that status was defined by one’s ability to tell stories. A member who is a social linguistic icon (someone with high visibility) can control their identity through stories in ways those without status cannot. Having good story skills gave some girls a stronger voice, allowing them to position themselves in relation to others and giving them the ability to shape the ideas and directions of the CoP. Those who have inadequate story skills might not be as skilled at communicating their ideas or are not comfortable doing so and, as a result, are not as visible and therefore not as powerful.

Taking these two views into consideration, it is apparent social status can be ascribed through identity formation. Yet it can also be ascribed by the structure of the community. Of course, Davies (2005) and Moore (2006) both studied offline CoPs when they made these arguments. Online CoPs are structured differently than offline communities because the technological infrastructure enables and constrains what people do in these communities. For example, Zhao and Bishop (2011) discovered that casual editors of Wikipedia began as readers, and then were able to transition into a role as editor because Wikipedia offered easy to use tools that allowed them to participate in the process of creating content. Rosenbaum and Shachaf (2010) used structuration theory to argue that members of online communities draw upon digital resources and are shaped by structural rules within the community. As users interact within the community, they constantly draw upon the resources made available to them. In turn, they are change and add to the structure of the community by answering questions, asking questions, evaluating content, and giving feedback. What also differentiates offline and online CoPs is that members can have social status quite literally attached to them by the website's design. Rosenbaum and Shachaf (2010) found that member reputation is calculated differently depending on the online community. For example, Yahoo Answers and Answerbag both measured a user's quantity and quality of contributions to the Q&A site and their reputation is shown to others. Wikipedia measured user's contributions to the whole website and gives users a choice to display their reputation or not.

Another way online communities assign users social status is by granting them moderator (mod) or administration (admin) privileges. Mods might be volunteers who are veterans of the community or they might be new to the community, but come in with previous experience

moderating other sites. Either way, they have been chosen by the admins to help to govern the online community. The main role of a mod is to encourage and regulate participation in the group and to keep up with general governing duties such as enforcing the website's rules (or their own rules) (Pisa, 2014). Evans et al. (2014) argued that even if a moderator starts a discussion, he or she should let the conversation go in different directions as members discuss different perspectives. Petric and Petrovic (2014) discovered that when moderators were active in discussions and justified their actions, they actually reduced users' sense of belonging and group identity. The authors hypothesized this was because mods might not follow community norms, but apply their own norms to the situation. Gray (2004) found that being part of the culture and social life of the community is a very important part of what makes a moderator effective. A moderator who interacts and understands the community can deepen the learning experience of other users.

Admins are the leaders of the website. Generally, the site's creator is an admin who then appoints others to be admins and mods to help govern the community. Admins have special rights and responsibilities that come along with the job description. "They can add or remove members from the community and, in the case of an infrastructure that provides archival capabilities, they can add or remove items from the archive...they can allow or reject posting, or can delegate these rights to particular others" (Butler, Sproull, Kiesler, & Kraut, 2007, p. 8). In smaller communities where the leadership might be sparse, admins might participate in the social aspect by facilitating conversations, "keeping groups focused, on-topic and running smoothly" (Holmes & Cox, 2011, p. 16). Admins are an important part of the community and are a determining factor of whether or not an online CoP dies or thrives (Holmes & Cox, 2011).

Remixing Groups as a CoP

The simplest definition of remixing is “to combine or edit existing materials to produce something new” (Everything is a Remix, n.d.). Jenkins et al. (2006) introduced the term “appropriation” to describe remixing and defined it as “process by which students learn by taking culture apart and putting it back together” (p.55). As opposed to beginning with a blank canvas, the video, literary work, or song “emerges through the artist’s engagement with previous cultural materials. Artists build on, are inspired by, appropriate, and transform other artists’ work” (p. 55). The art of remixing is centuries old. Many of the great works of fiction (such as *The Iliad* and *The Odyssey* by Homer and the plays of William Shakespeare) are a result of the author’s mixing and matching of existing content. The story of King Arthur is a result of generations of authors retelling, elaborating, and putting their own spin on existing stories. In the 21st century, remixing takes on many forms, including changing a song’s genre and structure; putting existing characters from TV, movies, and books into new stories (fanfiction); and re-editing video footage, mixing and mashing it with other footage, adding special effects, and putting it to music (fan-made music videos).

Learning to remix offers digital literacy skills that are not always obvious, but are nonetheless important for twenty-first century users (Jenkins et al., 2006). Because users are working with preexisting texts, they must recognize that someone else cares about the characters and stories they are changing (Stedman, 2012). In online communities, this offers technological advantages not available offline, such as being able to learn from comments and posts from other remixers and having access to forums where users can receive help from the collective knowledge of the community (Black, 2005).

Although no studies have looked at remixing through the lens of CoP theory, some have identified aspects of these communities that associate them with many CoP concepts. For example, young writers on the website harrypotterfanfiction.com create original stories based on Harry Potter characters. This website rejects content based on subject matter that is overly violent or sexual, and not the use improper grammar or spelling. So members' works are assigned to others who review and proofread. In this way, members become better writers and content producers (Ito, 2010). Navas, Gallagher, and Burrough (2015) called remixing culture a "do-ocracy" because it is maintained not by some governing body, but by other remixers. The whole point is to share one's creations; rules come in to play through the everyday interactions of the participants.

Rationale

Mutual engagement, joint enterprise, and shared repertoire are essential to learning and community formation within online communities, yet they are enacted differently from one community to the next. Websites such as Wikipedia, which have communities built around them, offer members structural opportunities to edit and transform the website together (e.g., Rosenbaum & Shachaf, 2010), while other communities are more about sharing knowledge and are therefore less constrained by technology. Members are there strictly to communicate about a topic (e.g., Evans et al., 2014). Still other communities are a combination of both (e.g., Paechter, 2012). Studies done in online communities focused on remixing have demonstrated that the three communication behaviors outlined above are likely occurring within these communities, yet there has been no research exploring remixing communities using CoP theory as a framework. Because there is a need to understand how these communication behaviors are enacted in

different online communities to fully understand the ways in which they can manifest, the following research question is asked:

RQ1: How are the three communication behaviors (mutual engagement, joint enterprise, and shared repertoire) enacted in an online community focused on remixing?

Social status is also an important part of CoP, yet there are different views on how it is ascribed to members. The creators of CoP view a member's identity and position in the community compared to other members as the way social status is ascribed (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998; Wenger & Trayner, 2015). Other researchers have found that level of involvement, as well as understanding and following norms, is also an important part of how members become "experts" (Stewart, 2005; Goldberg & Mackness, 2009; Boven, 2014). Davies (2005) criticized these definitions as too vague and argued that social status should be based on power given by the governing body and the structural elements of the community. Moore (2006) responded by saying that this would limit researchers who were trying to go into CoPs without preconceived notions of how social status is ascribed. Yet research has shown that online CoPs do have structural elements in place that can define a member's social status (Zhao & Bishop, 2011; Rosenbaum & Shachaf, 2010). As this research indicates, social status is not ascribed the same way in every community. There are different ways in which members identify their social status such as denying their expertise, telling stories, giving advice, etc. Online communities of practice might also add structural elements that might change how social status is ascribed (i.e., rankings) and give new members opportunities to attain social status in ways that are impossible

in offline communities (i.e., lurking). It is also not clear on how social status and peer-to-peer learning are connected. Thus the following research questions are asked:

RQ2: How is social status ascribed in an online community of practice focused on remixing?

RQ3: How does this affect peer-to-peer learning?

Chapter 2: Method

This study uses qualitative methods to answer these research questions. Creswell (2013) suggested that qualitative methods work best if the study's goal is to understand interactions and individuals, not the mean. Boven (2014) argued that a qualitative study enables the researcher to learn from the process and allows for new discoveries and insights because qualitative research is both inductive and deductive in nature. Because goals of the present research are to explore the nature of peer-to-peer learning and social status, a qualitative method seems appropriate. The specific method used in this study is Netnography (Kozinets, 2010; Kozinets et al., 2014; Kozinets 2015). Netnography is evolution of sorts in what Hines (2000) called a virtual ethnography. This method involves the researcher(s) collecting data by spending time in and interacting with an online community. Data can include interviews, interactions of members, and web documents. (However, this study will only include observations of interactions and web documents.) Studying online communities in this way is not a new approach. Many authors have successfully used a strictly observational online ethnography to study peer-to-peer learning in online communities (see Black, 2005; Waldron, 2009; Boven, 2014; Paechter, 2012). This section first presents in depth look at AMV.org as a community and website, then discusses sampling methods, research ethics, and data analysis.

AMV.org as an Online Community

Kozinets (2010) suggested looking for five characteristics when choosing an online community to study. He advised that “researchers should favor communities that (1) are more ‘research question relevant,’ (2) have a higher traffic of postings, (3) have larger numbers of discrete message posters, (4) have more detail or descriptively rich data, and (5) have more

between member interactions of the type required of the research question” (p. 264). AMV.org is a suitable research site to study peer-to-peer learning as it displays many of these characteristics. This website encourages members to create music videos by splicing and editing preexisting anime and adding music to it. In order to make a good anime music video, users must be able to pick and choose clips that fit the music and convey the emotion they seek to communicate. This requires them to critically analyze and evaluate media messages (Jenkins et al., 2006). When they post videos, they receive feedback on their work in the form of comments. The creators of these videos value comments from fellow producers over fan ratings because it helps validate and improve their creations. Many users found the best way to get this feedback was to view other producers’ videos and leave constructive feedback (Ito et al., 2010).

This study will use relevant aspects of Hara et al.’s. (2009) typology of CoPs to examine demographics, context, and membership characteristics of AMV.org. Hara et al. (2009) extended Dubé, Bourhis, Jacob, & Koohang’s (2006) typology of formal online CoPs to include informal ones as well, thus making an effective organizational framework for identifying and categorizing online CoPs.

AMV.org was not created by a company to solve any problem. It was created as a "place where people who enjoy and create anime music videos can get together, share ideas, learn from one another, and ultimately have everyone creating and enjoying better videos" (AMV.org, About Us, para. 1). AMV.org was created in 2000 (Hunsinger & Senft, 2014) and, according to its home page, has 912,476 members (as of October 2015), which classifies it as a large community (Hara et al., 2009). AMV.org is open to all who are interested because it only requires the user to enter a valid email address, create a password, and choose a username.

Becoming a member offers perks such as the ability to preview music videos without downloading them and vote in community contests. Membership also gives members the chance to become creators (users who have the ability to upload a music video). As of October 2015, there were 53,711 creators listed on the AMV.org home page. Members come from the USA and other countries (While revealing one's physical location is not a requirement, many provide it). AMV.org appears to be a knowledge-sharing culture, as members seem to value giving each other information (Hara et al., 2009). One forum, for example, is labeled "opinion exchange" and is intended to promote a feedback loop for video creators. On each uploaded video there is also a place where users can rate the video and offer an explanation of their critique.

Hara et al. (2009) outline three types of leadership in online communities: active participants, founding members, and moderators. Active participants gain leadership by the frequency of engagement and high visibility. Although there were no official records on AMV.org, examining user profiles, total number of posts, and the average number of posts per day revealed a large number of active members. Founders are the members who created the online community. Kris McCormic (aka Phade) was the original creator of AMV.org, but stepped down from his admin role and left the job to a small staff of users (AMV.org, About Section, para 1). At the time of this writing, though, Phade was an admin once again. As of 2016, AMV.org has nine moderators and five administrators. The only way to see all of the leadership in one place was to click on a link labeled "The Team," which is accessed through a drop down menu on the forum home page or through a link at the bottom of the forum page.

The AMV.org Website

When a user first comes upon AMV.org they are greeted with a bright logo indicating they have reached the correct website (Figure 1). On the home page they have the option of signing up or logging in, or going to one of the seven areas listed on the left of the navigation bar: "MEMBERS MAIN PAGE," "SEARCH FOR AMVs," "FORUM," "HOW-TO GUIDES," "SITE FAQ," "ABOUT US," and "LOGIN."

Once a user has registered and/or logged in they now have access to eighteen tabs on the left including: "MY ACCOUNT," "SEARCH FOR AMV," "FANS," "EDITORS," "COMMUNITY," "DONATE," "GUIDES," "CONTESTS," "SITE HELP," and so on (see Figure 2 for a complete list). These tabs expand to allow the user to indicate a specific location they wish to travel to. On the right are links to "GLOBAL STATISTICS," "TOP STATS," "BANNER AD CONTESTS," and "NEW JOURNAL ENTRIES." The middle of the page lists all the music videos a user has watched and displays stats for each. Because this study is interested in learning and social status, not how accounts are made or how contests are run, I will focus on describing the "COMMUNITY" section (which contains the most interactions) and the "SEARCH FOR ANIME" section (because there are many references to this area in the data).

When a user clicks on the "COMMUNITY" tab, it expands to give the user an option to navigate to "CHAT ROOMS," "FORUM," "MY JOURNAL BUDDIES," "SEARCH FOR MEMBERS," or the "SITE STORE." Clicking on the "FORUM" tab brings the user to the forum home page (Figure 3). The forum is divided into five categories: "ANNOUNCEMENTS," "ANIME MUSIC VIDEOS," "ANIME," "EDITING & TECHNOLOGY" and "WEB SITE." Each of these categories has sub topics and navigating to each page opens up deeper levels of the

website (see Figures 4 and 5). For each topic the number of posts, replies and views is listed, and by clicking on the topic a user can view these posts. At the bottom of the main forum page a “WHO IS ONLINE” section keeps track of who is visiting the forum and divides users into, registered, hidden, and guest status.

Instead of navigating to the forum, a user could instead search for AMVs. All the videos are separate from the forum, although links to them can be posted. When a user clicks on this tab they are given the option to do a “SUPER SEARCH”, look at the “NEWEST VIDEOS” or “NEWEST VIDEOS,” filter videos “BY ANIME” or “BY MUSICAN,” or see everything by clicking on “ALL SEARCH OPTIONS.” After a user enters search terms, he/she is given a list of videos relevant to the search, including the artist and song, the anime used, and how many opinions and hits (views) the video has received. By clicking on the video’s name, a user can view the its information and see the creator's profile by clicking on his/her pseudonym. Here others can see the users overall ratings for their videos in the following categories: “Originality,” “Visual,” “Sound,” “Synch,” “Lip,” “Effects,” “Effort,” “Re-View,” and “Overall” (Figure 6). User videos are displayed underneath their profile. Clicking on the name of video brings a user to an area where more information is posted, including opinions (Figure 7). More detail of each opinion can be seen by clicking on “More Opinion Info,” which links the user to comments in each category (Figure 8).

Data Collection and Sampling

During my Netnography, I only collected archival data in threads of comments that occurred on forums or bulletin boards within an online community. This type of data also includes information on web pages and member profiles. To collect these data, I copied and

pasted comment threads into Microsoft OneNote documents (which I stored on a password-protected computer) (Kozinets, 2015). Although I did not interview any participants, observing interactions has been shown to be an effective way to study learning within online communities because it “enable[s] researchers to see learning as it is happening rather than relying on retrospective accounts of past learning collected through self-report data” (Ziegler, Paulus, & Woodside, 2014, p. 74). Other studies have also used strictly observational methods to study online communities because it offers the researcher opportunities to collect data without interfering with the culture (see Waldron, 2009; Black, 2005; Atay, 2009).

When examining activity in any online community, it is important to note that not all listed members participate in the community. Researchers trying to engage with community members often hold to the 90-9-1 rule (Nielsen, 2006), which states that out of 100 members in a community, 90% of users will lurk, 9% will comment and engage to a certain extent, and 1% will get deeply involved with the community. Schneider (2011) suggests that, with the onset of Internet enabled cell phones, members can access communities much more frequently. So for online communities, a better rule might be 70-20-10. While neither rule is likely to be exact in every online community, they both point out that not everyone can be part of the sample, as the data from lurkers cannot be included. Their data is non-existent until they post comments. Because this study is focused on interactions, the sample only includes those who interact with others in the community. Even with these ratios in mind, there are a large number of people who might interact (anywhere from 82,830 to 248,491 members). However, because these numbers are still quite large, further sampling boundaries must be applied.

Relevance is an important criterion when choosing sampling boundaries. The most relevant sampling method is based on this study's research questions. The review of the literature revealed a pattern of the most common communication actions associated with mutual engagement, joint enterprise, shared repertoire, and social status. These patterns were used to help identify and code the conversation threads (see appendix B for coding scheme 1 and 2). Because I was looking for interactions between users I only studied conversation threads where there were more than three replies to the original post. In addition, because the purpose of this research was to study peer-to-peer learning, I only collected data in the forum sections devoted to anime, music videos, and editing.

My initial sampling was guided by the concepts laid out in the literature review, but it was also important to ask questions during data collection, such as whether the data are emotional, unexpected, or unusual. Data should be interesting and have emotional appeal because the goal of a Netnography is to tell the community's story. It was also important to pay attention to unexpected data that goes against preconceived theoretical notions. This can lead to new ideas and findings that might not be initially conceptualized. Ignoring this can lead to a "Black Swan" fallacy, which involves ignoring evidence that goes against one's hypotheses. To cover up findings that are contrary to expectations is an unethical practice, as it inhibits new discoveries and goes against the goal of understanding the phenomenon (Kozinets, 2015). Hence, I allowed for new discoveries to emerge using conceptually-driven, sequential sampling. This type of data collection is not driven by random selection, but is purposeful in nature. Theory guides the researcher in what to look for, but does not restrict their interpretation of the data. A researcher must be willing to constantly reevaluate their sampling because "observing one class

of events invites comparison with another; and understanding one key relationship in the setting reveals facets to be studied in others” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p.27).

In summary, my sampling boundaries were to collect data that were: 1) within the limits of AMV.org, 2) visible part of the community (i.e., lurkers would not be studied until they become participants), 3) based on concepts laid out in the literature review, 4) involved conversations between users, 5) found in forum sections devoted to the practice of AMV creation, and 6) offered something beyond the theory that is unusual and interesting.

Data Analysis

My data analysis was based on grounded theory. When using a grounded theory method of data analysis, it is important to use deductive and inductive reasoning; deductive because initial categories are built on the review of the literature and inductive because the data is allowed to shape the categories (Creswell, 2014). Grounded theory is not tied to a specific method for data collection, but is primarily used to analyze interviews and observations. That being the case, this method of analysis is well-suited to this research. When using grounded theory, data analysis happens right after the first observation and employs a continual back-and-forth between examining the data, coding, and analyzing. Thus, the goal is to gain understanding of core phenomena and develop an organizing structure based on collected data (Flick, 2014).

Kozinets (2010) suggests an inductive sequence to this coding method. To do this, he adapts Miles’ and Huberman’s (1994) steps for use in a Netnography. The first step is coding, which involves a very broad reading of the text, but also a narrower reading of difficult or insightful passages in order understand them better. To do this, I collected two or three conversations and “noted” or “memoed” by color coding and labeling different parts of text to

indicate examples of mutual engagement, joint enterprise, shared repertoire, or social status. I did this a total of four times for each conversation, and each time I coded for a different concept.

The second step is “abstracting and comparing,” which is the process of understanding relationships between the phenomenon and concepts. It consists of sorting and refining the codes obtained in the first coding process in order to create the categories most pertinent to the research questions. These categories are constantly tested and retested against the data, paying particular attention to areas where there might be something unusual (e.g., a “Black Swan”). To do this, I re-examined previously coded data a fifth time to create a final memo for each conversation. In this memo I noted and discussed the most pertinent findings of the conversation and organized them according to the concept(s) they exemplified. In this step, I also looked for unusual and interesting data that did not fit into existing theory.

The third step is checking and refinement, which involves returning to the field to collect more data “in order to isolate, check, and refine understanding of the patterns, processes, commonalities, and differences” (Kozinets, 2010, p.119). In this step I went back to the field (AMV.org) to collect more data, and repeated steps one and two.

The fourth step is generalizing, which is the process of explaining and elaborating upon consistencies in the data (Kozinets, 2010). This ended when I reached the point where coding, memoing, and refinement did not yield any new insights (i.e., saturation). I took the best examples from the data and put them into a master memo. From there, I further organized them into separate categories based on communication actions associated with mutual engagement, joint enterprise, shared repertoire, social status, and unusual findings. In this step I also began using relevant literature to make sense of the patterns emerging from the data.

The fifth and final step is “theorizing,” when the central ideas and generalizations of the study are compared and contrasted with existing literature in order to construct new “theory.” This step involved identifying the best examples of the concepts found in the community and engaging with existing literature to explain my findings.

Ethics

When dealing with archival data, there is a debate about the ethics of using conversations that occur in online forums as part of research. On one hand, some users want to be accurately quoted and identified because it provides free publicity. On the other hand, there are users who might not want their names and quotes to be used in research (Kozinets, 2015). Black (2005) suggested that users “realize their public posts may be taken up and analyzed” (p.121). This implies that conversations on a public forum (that is, a forum anyone with an internet connection can access) are fair game for researchers. She does caution that, when dealing with online posts, it is important to alter user names and quotes by using pseudonyms and paraphrasing, thereby concentrating on interactions rather than users. This is important because altering users’ words can make them harder, but not impossible, to find with advanced search engine algorithms. It is easy to type a quotation (even one that has been slightly altered) into a search engine and link it to a user's pseudonym. Pseudonyms can then be connected to the user's real name if they disclose personal information on their profile. However, not quoting causes problems as well because it stops other researchers from seeing the research in context.

The ethical lines are hazy in purely observational Netnography, but if the researcher’s goals are to do no harm and respect participants, there are options in place to protect all those involved. Kozinets (2015) suggests three degrees of concealment when dealing with data:

uncloaked, cloaked and maximally cloaked. He suggests that “when risks are low, and where the figure is public, use an uncloaked representation. Providing an uncloaked representation means using the online pseudonym or real name of the research participant in the research report” (p. 157). AMV.org falls under the uncloaked category because it is not a private community (anyone can view the material without signing up), and the topics researched (peer-to-peer learning, and social status) are not demeaning or culturally unacceptable. Despite this uncloaked status, I erred on the side of caution. When writing about my observations I replaced user pseudonyms with my own (Kozinets et al., 2014). I did not change quotes, though, because I wanted others to be able to understand them in context if they so desired.

Another ethical consideration was entering and understanding the community. Because I did not want to assume I knew everything about the culture of AMV.org, I was careful to research the website’s background before starting the data collection part of my Netnography. In this stage, I simply made a profile with a pseudonym for my name and explored the many forums on the website. I also watched snippets of music videos and read the feedback users gave each other. In doing this, I developed a basic grasp of the “particular history, social structures, codes of etiquettes, particular ways of speaking, and unique rituals and identities” (Kozinets et al., 2014, p. 266). After I had an adequate grasp of the site, I made my presence known to the community by posting a general description of my study and a link to my research website (learningremixed.wordpress.com). Kozinets (2015) emphasizes that it is important not to be deceitful when representing oneself in the online community, and so the tagline of my profile identifies me as a researcher and explains the general purpose of the research. He also recommends adding personal details to make the researcher more personable. So on my website,

I explain my interest in remixing as something of educational value, my enjoyment of anime, and my background in music creation. There have been incidents where researchers have come into fandom communities without trying to understand and relate to the members, and the results have not been pleasant (Stedman, 2012). Members in fandom communities do not appreciate being studied as some sort of unusual specimen and might publically critique the research. While this might be an extreme case, it signifies the importance of being careful to understand the community before making one's presence known.

After spending approximately seven weeks on AMV.org, collecting and analyzing a total of fifteen conversations and six theoretically relevant posts, I reached a point of saturation. At this point, data collection was concluded and the remaining stages of data analysis were completed.

Chapter 3: Mutual Engagement, Joint Enterprise, and Shared Repertoire

Mutual engagement, joint enterprise, and shared repertoire can take different forms depending on the community observed. No matter where they are observed, these concepts are useful to describe the ways CoP members interact. Mutual engagement describes how users “draw on each other and are engaged in doing things together” (Evans et al., 2014, p. 216). Joint enterprise describes the community’s understanding and negotiation of the practice. Shared repertoire is focused on the resources and language a community develops as they interact and create together. The following chapter will examine each of these communication behaviors in turn and how they were enacted on AMV.org.

Mutual Engagement

Mutual engagement describes how users in a community work together to learn a practice. Wenger (1998) defined this concept as community members “discovering how to engage, what helps and what hinders; developing mutual relationships; defining identities, establishing who is who, who is good at what, who knows what, who is easy or hard to get along with” (p.95). Studies of online CoPs have found this to involve users asking questions, challenging one another, seeking feedback, sharing expertise, problem solving, high participant interaction, and stories told to give context and encouragement (Evans et al., 2014; Rosenbaum & Shachaf, 2010; Paechter, 2012). Mutual engagement on AMV.org took the form of questions (asked and answered) and stories to give context and provide support in stressful situations.

Questions. Users generally ask questions in order to learn more about the practice of the community (Paechter, 2012). Here a user named Puhola asks no one in particular if Final Cut Pro will be easy to learn if s/he is already familiar with Adobe Premiere:

What is the difference between adobe premiere and final cut video editing software? Besides Final Cut is on a Mac and Premiere is on a PC, what are the differences? I am taking a college class that teaches Final Cut. I am excited to learn Final Cut because I know it is the industry standard. But I own premiere and a pc. Will learning Final Cut help me to understand Adobe Premiere? (Oct, 2009).

Another user (Dekubo) answers the question by saying the two software types are very similar, but does not simply answer the question, s/he also shares his/her own experience by saying:

if it makes you feel any better i started with premiere and it was a hell of a lot easier when i had to use final cut in class because most of the basic timeline and effects where the same (Oct, 2009).

A third user named Bowlwits also chimes in on the subject:

i love using premiere, good for green screen work (Jun, 2010).

Learning from others by asking questions has been dubbed “social reference” and has mainly been studied on Q&A websites such as Yahoo Answers and Answerbag. One of the primary reasons users prefer to ask their social group questions is because they can use this opportunity to both attain knowledge and socialize (Shachaf, 2010). In this conversation, Puhola asks a question that could be Googled, but s/he seems to want more than just a straight answer as s/he shares background to the question. Dekubo directly answers the question, but did not have to share the extra bit of information. S/he could have just simply said the two software types are the same and that would have been enough to answer the question, but s/he uses this opportunity to share something in common with Puhola. Bowlwits then adds further insight to the uses of Adobe Premiere by showing commonality and also adding insight into the further uses of the editing software.

Another instance of Q&A occurring is when a user named GodlyRoman asks for advice on the best approach for getting the best clips for a video:

During the 'Scene Selection' phase, how many times do you view each episode until you feel like you have memorized all of the important scenes, character expressions, body position, background, etc? I've read in one specific book that mentions that one needs to read a book 10 to 15 times in order to fully understand all of its contents. And if I recall correctly, the author said that the same method applies to videos. (Oct, 2015).

VeperFad, SirEyesic, and Nonkio are just a few of the many users who share their approach to the subject:

VeperFad: I only need to view them once. I can scan through episodes in the "trimmer" in Sony Vegas to find what I need. Maybe twice, if I feel like taking notes (like actual notes on a paper that says what ep and where to find it) if it's a long series. Most of the time in my videos, I just make it up as I go along (Oct, 2015).

SirEyesic: 2 should be more than enough, the first time just watch it normaly, get a feel for potential scenes you might want to include in your video, the 2nd time around watch it with a notepad file open aswell, and everytime a scene, moment, line or even gesture that you think it could add to your amv, pause, and take notes in the notepad, like for example (Oct, 2015).

Nonkio: I rarely make AMVs from series I haven't seen many, many, many times. So I usually know exactly where the scene is exactly in what episode before I start editing (Nov, 2015).

In Horowitz's and Kamvar's (2010) study of a social engine called Ardvark (which was made for users to find answers from one another), the authors suggested that users' questions are sometimes better answered by other users, especially if the questioners seek opinions or contextual information. For example, a user might ask where to go on a "date with a spunky and spontaneous young woman" (p. 438). This query by GodlyRoman is an example of a question that does not have simple an answer. S/he seems to want a second opinion from other users because s/he has just read a book that says one thing, but now s/he wants clarification if the same rule should be applied to videos. A specific answer to this question would be hard, if not impossible, to get from a search engine. GodlyRoman already knows the official answer to the

question, but now s/he wants a second opinion – one that can best be answered by other users of this community. Users do not necessarily agree on the same answer, but they offer their own unique perspectives on the subject which provides both detail and context. Because the experience is social and users work together to answer questions, the answers are more reliable because they have the opportunity to correct each other (Shachaf, 2010). In this conversation VeperFad and SirEyesic offer their opinions on the subject by saying they watch it one or two times. Then Nonkio says that s/he rarely makes a music video from an anime s/he has not seen over and over. There appear to be two schools of thought at work here, one that says watching Anime a couple times is enough, and another that says one needs to be very familiar with the material before making a video. Users worked together to offer GodlyRoman options, but left it up to him/her to decide how to proceed.

Asking each other questions is an important part of the peer-to-peer learning experience because as users go about the practice of the community, they might run into difficulties and need help from more experienced users. Although AMV.org does not have the extensive categories and rewards systems that Q&A sites exhibit, it can act as a type of social reference search engine where users get answers to their specific questions about anime music videos. This aligns with social reference theory, which suggests users enjoy asking each other questions more than using a traditional search engine. Users on AMV.org appeared to use questions not only to gain knowledge, but also to socialize and interact with others (Shachaf, 2010). This was apparent because users would ask questions that could be easily answered by a search engine. In addition, because users asked questions that did not have straight answers, other users could add their own insights and correct each other, making the answer more reliable (Horowitz & Kamvar, 2010).

Stories. Stories are used in online CoPs to add backstory to user's questions and answers, but can also be used as moral support when users gather around each other to give moral support (Paechter, 2012). For example, JapanRocks tells the story of how she wanted to upload a video to her YouTube channel so her boyfriend could see it:

So, I'm finishing up my second AMV and I've worked VERY hard on it and I am happy with how it turned out so far. I tried to make my WIP unlisted on YouTube so I could show my boyfriend what I had done so far, but the song is owned by Sony :cry: . I have a section in the middle where the song cuts out and there is a bit of the intro music, but I'm sure that doesn't matter. I have submitted a request to Sony to get license to the song so that I can use it and that I would not monetize for my own gain (May, 2015).

WineandPizza offers a work around to the problem of copyright:

0: totally anecdotal so take it with a grain of salt, but in my experience if you acknowledge the copyright claim by clicking video manager then the blue link next to the video in question it should be fine? they sometimes put ads on or little song info things in the video description. sometimes they also block the video in certain countries or mute the audio but its not that common unless its a super popular song? disputing the claim just opens up a big can of worms @_@ but also upload to the org when its done if you want! (May, 2015).

Another user named Catkins responds by telling his/her own story:

I dealt with this years ago when I made an AMV to a Paramore song, and it kept muting the audio whenever I tried to upload it no matter what I did. In the end I gave up, and the copyright lapsed years later and finally stopped muting the audio when I uploaded it. Nowadays before starting a video I'll usually do a quick search for the song on YouTube; if the only results you get are the official video, cover songs, or pitched versions of the song, it probably has a strict copyright enforcement on it... It's up to you to decide if it's worth forgoing putting your video on YouTube to use that song, or if you want to alter the song in some way (it looks like people are still doing pitch shifting) or use a cover song instead. It sucks because most everyone goes to YouTube to see videos, but that's what happens when you appropriate other people's copyrighted works, I guess. I don't recommend filing a dispute though... you probably won't get anywhere (May, 2015).

Kiore is frustrated with YouTube as a whole, and suggests alternatives:

try pitching out or tempo-change the audio, but in my personal experience is more like gambling. programs like audacity let you do some audio editing. try vevo or dailymotion, even mediafire, there are lot of option to share not as complicated as youtube (May, 2015).

Users seem excited and willing to share their experiences to help JapanRocks deal with her copyright problem because they feel frustrated with dealing with this aspect of the practice. Ikore makes it clear that the experience of trying to work around copyright is akin to “gambling,” and Catkins says the experience of dealing with copyright “sucks.” Berger (2011) found that when people are in a higher state of arousal they are actually more likely to share information with one another. Because copyright is an issue the members of AMV.org frequently confront, they might be more likely to respond with their own stories when they learn a fellow member has been wronged (so to speak). Catkins and WineandPizza advise against trying to dispute the claim because it will not lead anywhere. This shows the frustration they seem to feel about this element of the practice. Also, Catkins’s comment about YouTube being a place where everyone watches videos has a certain unhappiness to it. He/she seems to imply that YouTube would be the preferred place to post videos, but that this desire is thwarted.

Stories can be used to add context and extra information to questions and answers, but they can also serve to bring the community closer together as the users act as unofficial support group (Paechter, 2012). One reason for an increase of stories and shared information on AMV.org might be because users feel frustrated because their practice of remixing is not always legitimized by other video sharing communities such as YouTube. This suggests that when an online community is focused on a practice that walks the line between legal and illegal (such as remixing), stories and information sharing might increase as users become more aroused and excited (Berger, 2011).

Joint Enterprise

Joint enterprise describes how members negotiate and understand the practice of the community, learning when to give and when to take, finding ways to reconcile different perspectives, holding each other accountable, and becoming accountable themselves (Wenger, 1998). Studies of online communities have found joint enterprise in the forms of negotiating what is on-topic and off-topic, working together to discourage flaming and trolling, evaluating info using specific expertise, and keeping the conversation going without the help of the moderators (Paechter, 2012; Rosenbaum & Shachaf, 2010; Evans et al., 2014)). Joint enterprise on AMV.org was enacted in the form of negotiation, accountability, and discussions of flaming.

Negotiation. Negotiation generally revolved around subjects that did not have set answers. Users negotiated about the best place to put a certain guide in a master list. At times, users could not agree on a topic or debated the placement of a resource in a guide. As users shared their opinions, their ideas on the topic began to converge, causing more social bonding and also creating a group learning experience. For example, here TreeBlitz challenges Shadimaria by saying his/her guide that it should be moved:

TreeBlitz: Awesome collection!! Just a few things I'd like to mention: My pen tool guide isn't meant to be Photoshop exclusive. I realize it's written from that angle, but the general gist of it is trying to help people understand a) what the pen tool is, b) how it functions across the entire Adobe Creative Suite and c) why it's important to someone making an AMV with masks (Jun, 2012)

Shadimaria says s/he is not sure where to put it, and questions the size of TreeBlitz's guide:

@TreeBlitz: yeah, now that you mention it, I see what you mean. But since I don't want to misrepresent your guide, do you have any particular preferences where I should put it in the list? I was thinking of removing the [Masking/Rotoscoping] label, and maybe moving it to section D. MISCELLANEOUS TECH, but since the guide is written from the perspective of Photoshop, I'm a bit torn where to put it. I may have to come up with entirely different categories too since the list is still

in it's infancy...And because I like being direct these days, I have a question for you TreeBlitz: Is there any way you could bring down the file size of the .pdf? I mean, it looks cool and all, but 77.7MB seems like a lot for an 18 page guide (Jun, 2012).

TreeBlitz says s/he would like to fix it, but the guide is filled with embedded videos:

The file is very large for a couple of reasons I take full blame for (mostly my ignorance at the time), but one of the main ones is that it contains a lot of high quality images and embedded videos. I don't know if I can redo the guide in a non-PDF format (I don't really "do" HTML), but I will give it a shot. Probably will take me awhile and I might need some technical help or guidance at some point... (Jul, 2012) :

After learning this, Shadimaria seems much more understanding:

Oh! Sorry, I didn't realize the guide had embedded videos! That actually makes a lot of sense now. It's just, in the beginning, all I saw was a .pdf that wasn't loading. Then I realized it was ~80MB and thought "wow that's big," but that makes sense now (Jul, 2012).

Nem-bo Studios then offers to help TreeBlitz fix his/her guide:

If you want to I'll style and organize your guide in HTML/web encode terms if you just update it and lay it down ;x (Jul, 2012)

Online communities bring together people that would likely never meet in the physical world. As a result, conflict might occur as cultures collide. Ferguson and Taminiau (2014) found that although more diverse communities tend to have more conflict, they actually enable greater mutual learning as long as they resolve the conflicts in a way that allows the community to grow. In their study, this resolution sometimes depended on the website coordinator to help negotiate and realign the values of the community. Users in online communities must also learn the skills of active listening, talking through differences, and compromising if they are going to effectively negotiate the practice (Jenkins et al., 2006). This conversation thread is noteworthy because the meaning of TreeBlitz's guide is questioned and evaluated. Shadimaria sees it as awkward

because of its size, TreeBlitz sees it as his/her proverbial baby. Throughout the conversation, users had to be willing to listen to each other, and their views started to converge as they negotiated how to best approach the problem. However, although each user wanted to help the other, they were unwilling to give up on certain needs. It took the intervention of a third party to help resolve the issue. This occurs when Nem-bo Studios says s/he will do the coding.

As mentioned in the description of the website, AMV.org has many users from diverse backgrounds, and this conversation displays that diversity. One member made a list of resources and has knowledge of the best way to format a guide, another member made a guide in the list, and a third member has the skills to make the guide all it can be. Because the conversation was in a forum where others could observe, it allowed users to help each other negotiate the problem. In doing so, they displayed how conflict can be used to bring members closer together as long it is dealt with properly (Ferguson & Taminiiau, 2014).

Accountability and Flaming. Accountability within online communities of practice revolves around users' self-monitoring and accountability. However, there were times when accountability was lacking on AMV.org, and members had to remind each other of their promised opinions. Accountability also speaks to how users work together to cultivate an encouraging environment and bond together to stop flaming (degrading comments). This is especially important in a large community such as this (the moderators and administrators cannot be everywhere at once, after all). On the whole AMV.org seemed to be a friendly place, with users thanking each other for help and being courteous, even in their disagreements. Flaming on AMV.org was generally frowned upon, but evidence suggests that flaming does occur in subtle ways. The resulting ambiguity made it hard for users to fight flaming behaviors.

Examples of accountability were especially obvious in the forum section entitled “opinion exchange,” as this area is intended to be a place where users review each other’s work using various exchange rates. (For example, 3:1 means a user would exchange three opinions for one opinion. Other variations include 1:1, 2:2, 3:3, etc.). Wizardup starts off a conversation thread by offering to give to give a 1:1, 2:2 or 3:3 review:

Hello, I am up for giving out quick and simplified opinions of people's edits. Post limit for AMV opinions up to 3! AMVs with entries posted on the .org, or direct download links are greatly appreciated! I won't visit any AMVs on YouTube here! ...Give me your opinions first, and I'll accept it as a signal for me to do likewise! I usually come back after a few weeks to a few months to look at the thread, since I want to watch a few in one go. I am open-minded, so I'll try to be as unbiased as possible! I will frequent this thread, so keep them coming! (Aug, 2015).

This forum section was created by someone in leadership, but is essentially run by the users, as they are the ones who must hold each other accountable to their promised reviews. Most of the conversations in this section involved users asking for opinions and confirming opinions. However, it seems users did not always follow through. In the same conversation, two users promise to review one of Wizardup’s videos when they have time and good internet connection:

KellMoondust 34576: Sure I'll take a look at three of your videos this weekend. I should have them up by Sunday for you In return could you look at the following 3 (Aug, 2015).

SirEyesic: I'll make sure to download your AMV's and be as honest and unbiased as I can once I get back home with some decent internet...a little 3:1, Here's my first attempt at making an actual AMV, I'd like to know your opinion if you'd be so kind :D (Aug, 2015).

They don’t follow through and Wizardup has to remind them:

KellMoondust 34576 and SirEyesic, have either of you two given any opinions? I might have missed it so can you tell me which you reviewed?...This'll be the last time I'll take initiative with opinions. xD (Sep, 2015).

A quick search of Wizardup's videos reveals the fact that neither of these users ever posted an opinion, but because Wizardup put in an escape clause in the original post by saying "*give me your opinions first*, and I'll accept it as a signal for me to do likewise!" (emphasis added) s/he did not have to give out a free opinion.

"Accountability is about delivering on a commitment. It's responsibility to an outcome, not just a set of tasks. It's taking initiative with thoughtful, strategic follow-through . . . [It] involves clear expectations, capability, measurement, feedback and consequences (Bregman, 2016, para 5). Because it was clear the others were supposed to review Wizardup's videos, it is not for lack of expectations. However, one aspect of the opinion exchange forum that is not clear is what happens if someone does not leave an opinion. It is possible that KellMoondust 34576 just forgot about it because s/he was not going to do it until Sunday, or it could be s/he did not have clear consequences. As for SirEyesic, it is possible that s/he might have gotten cold feet and not given a review because s/he felt s/he lacked the capability to do a good job, as s/he does admit in an earlier post that the video s/he wanted reviewed was his/her first music video. While a search of the opinion exchange revealed that this lack of give and take is an uncommon occurrence, this conversation reveals that users might not always be accountable to each other.

Another aspect of accountability involves encouraging a positive atmosphere and keeping flaming to a minimum. Flaming can be defined as a hostile expression of strong emotions such as swearing, insults, and name-calling" (Lee, 2005, p. 385). One example of users encouraging each other is when a user named WineandPizza posts a video and others applaud him/her for not making the video with just action, or just angst. Memegirl makes it clear how much s/he enjoyed the video:

This could've easily been another completely angsty or action-oriented video but you took a much more meaningful approach to it and I loved every second of it. I don't even have anything more worth saying because it hit all the right notes and was just generally great (Feb, 2016).

Despite this positive atmosphere, there appeared to be a need to discuss flaming and evidence that it had occurred. In this conversation thread, Kamikita is teased for claiming his/her video is going to be the most original music video. Dawata describes the comments as flaming:

The reason people are flaming you here is because you basically said "Yo guys, I have this amazing idea that involves me editing most of the most overused sources. It will be awesome!! Should I make amv like this?" You already decided to make it since you think it is awesome... why don't you just finish it and be done with it (Mar, 2013).

Flaming in online communities is more damaging than most people think it is. For example, spiteful humor might be interpreted as humor and nothing more, while in reality it has consequences both online and off (Jane, 2016). The comments Dawata describe as flaming are not what some might describe as hateful. However, this comment by Nonkio suggests more serious flaming has occurred in this community:

I've started editing again, but I think it's fair to say that I've never been part of the AMV scene as a whole. Even back in the late 90s, my entire AMV world was really relegated to handful of people. A number of those people have retired, some of them have outright disappeared, and a few have actually died. Others have finally given up on being vocal because they have become fed up with the petty sniping which has zero to do with criticism of AMVs, and everything to do with personal attacks (Dec, 2015).

In Awesome_Mae's FAQ guide s/he gives his/her insight on the subject of flaming:

Q: So why do Youtube editors and Org editors bump heads?

A: The primary reason behind that is because of how each community views criticism. When leaving a negative comment on a youtube video, most are accustomed to receiving quite a bit of backlash from other commenters or sometimes even the editor. Whereas the majority of editors on the Org actually like to get both negative and positive feedback. On the org we like to go beyond like or dislike and try to share our opinions with the editor so they can continue to

improve and have fun. No one says anything negative about a video with malicious intent, they're just trying to help the way that others have helped them. We take flaming very seriously but there is a difference between feedback "Your audio sounded staticy." and flaming "you suck. lol i hope you die." This of course isn't to say that the only people on youtube are those that can't take criticism, there are plenty of people that can. This has just been the primary problem and difference we've seen between youtube and Org editors (Dec, 2012).

Awesome_Mae seems pretty confident that AMV.org is different than other websites such as YouTube because s/he says that users give constructive feedback and "No one says anything negative about a video with *malicious intent*" (emphasis added). On the other hand, Nonkio makes it plain that flaming does or has occurred at some point during AMV.org's existence.

These two different responses make sense in light of Lee's (2005) finding that users adopt a variety of different strategies for dealing with flaming. These strategies are organized into three categories: competitive dominating, avoiding, and cooperative integrating. Nonkio's description of users giving up being vocal is a prime example of an avoidance strategy that users on AMV.org might have used to deal with flaming because "one of the potential consequences of flaming is provoking a participant to withdraw or temporarily or permanently drop out of the group" (Lee, 2005, p. 392). Awesome_Mae seems to be using a more cooperative integrating strategy of normalizing (which tends to overlook the damage flaming can do) or redefines it in some way. This points to a lack of a clear definition of what constitutes flaming on AMV.org.

Comments by other users support this ambiguity. Here Jagaz struggles with the fine line that must be walked between constructive feedback and flaming:

I tried to be as helpful as I could, I hope it didn't come across as critical since I was going 'mad' into detail there (Sep, 2015).

A user named Springer echoes this uncertainty:

Obviously, I've tried not to be very rude to anyone, or at least I think I've tried. Some editors didn't see it that way. All I can do is try to be mindful of what I'm posting, but it's gotten to the point where I find myself tiptoeing around every point I want to make, lest I start drama and make enemies with people here when I'm just trying to start a conversation or keep one going (Dec, 2015).

Rosenbaum and Shachaf (2010) found that keeping the community safe from negative comments is an important part of joint enterprise, and one way users moderate themselves is by reporting abuse to leadership. However, both of these posts reveal users might have different views on the definition of flaming. This lack of a clear definition is likely to restrict users' abilities to report flaming and bond together in the fight against it. This, in turn, might cause subtler forms of flaming to occur and be a detriment to users learning from each other. Boehmer, (2015) suggested users exposed to discussions containing flaming have a reduction in knowledge gain. Flaming can also annoy people to an extent where they no longer want to read a conversation or the article the conversation was based on, therefore reducing what they learned.

Compared to other websites such as usenet.com (Lee, 2005) and YouTube, AMV.org seems like a friendly place where users hold each other accountable and blatant flaming is kept to a minimum. However, there was evidence to suggest that users were not always responsible and flaming did occur. Lack of clarity seems to be culprit in both cases. Without clear consequences to their actions, users do not always follow through with their promised actions. There was also ambiguity regarding what constituted flaming, which meant users' ability to self-moderate was limited. This reduces users' capabilities of learning from each other because they might become turned off by the community. This suggests that although flaming is not always obvious in online communities, it might take less conspicuous forms. This echoes Jane's (2016) call for seemingly mild forms of ridicule to be taken seriously. It also suggests that online

communities need clear definitions of their views on flaming if users are going to self-moderate as Rosenbaum and Shachaf (2010) expect.

Shared Repertoire

Shared repertoire describes how online CoPs will develop a catalogue of useful resources and display attributes that make it unique among other communities (Murillo, 2008). This repertoire can take many different forms and “includes tools, routine, stories, jargon, shortcuts, or any resource that might be used over time in a shared pursuit to negotiate meaning” (Evans et al., 2014, p. 216). These resources include shared links and tools (Waldron, 2009), establishing a unique language in the form of jargon (Evans et al., 2014), telling inside jokes that bond the community together (Paechter, 2012), and referencing and utilizing old previous comments (Rosenbaum & Shachaf, 2010). This study found evidence to suggest that links and tools were shared, and jokes and jargon were used on AMV.org.

Links and Tools. Wenger (1998) recognized that members in communities develop or adopt their own set of tools which they use to further the practice. Part of this involves the constant need to renegotiate and evolve in order to stay current. Users on AMV.org seem to be quite willing to put time and effort into creating guides for music video creation. They also spent time making sure the material was relevant, however, with the quickly changing virtual landscape of the web it was hard to stay on top of everything.

Guides on AMV.org were plentiful and covered a wide variety of topics. Here, one user offers another user help in the form of two guides:

Mountaingirl: I just joined the ORG this afternoon. Do people here just post AMV's as "topics"? This is my first time using any sort of site like this (Apr, 2016).

MireRed: yep. As long as you have the video cataloged, you can post it in the AMV Announcements forum here: viewforum.php?f=3 If you have any questions on how to do it or anything else about the site, you can look at the overall site FAQ here: viewtopic.php?f=15&t=125099 (Apr, 2016).

If a user clicks on any of the forum sections on AMV.org, they are greeted with user guides of all types. MireRed's link points to a FAQ made by him/her, but Awesome_Mae also wrote an extensive FAQ document. Both of these were made even though one was already written by Phade (the founder of AMV.org). Other users have also created guides to making good music videos, being an effective project coordinator, and so on. This seems to point to AMV.org as a community that is willing to do some work to inform others. This concurs with Kollock and Smith (1996), who noted that one sign of a well-organized community was the existence of "institutional documents" developed to help others learn about the practice.

In order for these guides to be effective, users must be willing to help keep them up to date. In a conversation thread following a long list of editing software (posted by TaranT in 2005) Shadimaria lets other members know it is not a useable guide:

Yeah, I agree. I think we need to somehow let people know what software is supported by people in the hobby, currently. This sticky may have been relevant in the past, but it's probably more confusing than anything now. Even these do a better job IMO: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_video_editing_software ... http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Comparison_of_video_editing_software (Jun, 2012)

Heckburn Master also responds to this guide by commenting on the usability of these tools:

The Company AIST doesn't sell editing software any longer, so MovieXOne Plus and MovieDV aren't available at all. (May, 2007).

In addition, some of the links in these guides did not always work. An example of a user pointing out a broken link on a video editing guide:

DinoMan1245: I want to point out though that in your "AMV app" site, the link you provided; <http://www.dvdfab.com/free.htm> no longer work (Apr, 2015).

Internet links (or URLs) can disappear or change without warning. If a link breaks, it can be very confusing for those who want to learn from the linked content or use a recommended tool. Sometimes links are meant to be temporary (e.g., links to college courses on .edu websites); other times the content might be moved to an archive section (e.g., news websites) or the URL can be sold and directed to different content (Markwell & Brooks, 2002). The ever-changing nature of links requires users to go back and look at the guides regularly. Shadimaria and Heckburn Master seem willing and able to do this. Heckburn Master makes a direct reference to a company that changed its policy, and although Shadimaria does not make reference to any links, s/he calls for an overhaul and suggests new resources (which would entail changing links). Despite Shadimaria's good intentions, s/he also falls prey to the ever-changing nature of links. As of April 2016, neither of the links s/he posted connected to video editing Wikipedia pages. This shows the need for a constant upkeep and accountability, not just on the main guides, but also on users' own links.

Links and guides are an essential part of shared repertoire. When members make the effort to create guides that offer insight into the practice, this points to the likelihood of an active community willing to go above and beyond what is expected (Kollock & Smith, 1996). AMV.org has no shortage of user-made guides that serve as tools and links to resources inside and outside the community. To be effective, though, the information on these guides must be updated and the links must be checked regularly (Markwell & Brooks, 2002). AMV.org users showed a willingness to update these guides and to let others know when the information was incorrect. Unfortunately, due to the changing nature of the internet, links can break. This requires the guide's creator or other willing users to revisit and repair the links. This can be a hard task,

especially if the guide contains many links. This suggests that when users create guides, they might want to include the most pertinent information on the website (Markwell & Brooks, 2002).

Jokes. As members of a community interact and develop a shared history, it is natural to make jokes and references that might not be readily apparent to new users. This can create a sense of comradery between those that share in the joke because “humor creates a common language [and creates a] uniqueness for the group because they [the jokes] do not mean a thing to a person from “outside”” (Ziv, 1984, p. 33). Not all jokes have to be inside jokes, though, as there are also references that an outsider might be able to appreciate and understand. This comment by TiptoQRD in response to Kamikita offer a perfect example of a joke that would need some background information to understand:

Kamikita: This sounds like blasphemy, but I don't watch much anime. I'm wanting to start a new video, but my source footage is starting to.. well, not match up with the times. And I would hate to use the same anime as I always do. Anyone mind throwing out some to me? (Oct, 2015).

TiptoQRD: if you ask me you already know what kind of anime I'll recommend (Oct, 2015).

Awesome_Mae adds insight into jokes on AMV.org on his/her frequently asked question guide:

Q: Ok, but it seems like a bunch of people have their own in-jokes? Or am I missing something? A: Yeah, I can't deny there are a decent amount of in-jokes. A lot of the members who frequent the forums in particular are friends both online and off. A lot of us have been on this website for many years, leading to some in-jokes developing. If you're curious about what we're talking about, feel free to ask. As previously stated, the majority of members are quite nice and we honestly hope you don't let a bad experience ruin what could be a lot of fun! (Dec, 2012).

Humor can build solidarity within the community. It becomes part of "the process by which individuals position themselves within a group" (Hübler & Bell, 2003, p. 287) as they construct jokes which align them with the humor of others. It is a way of saying "you and I are

alike, we think the same kind of jokes are funny.” In order to fully comprehend TiptoQRD’s joke, a user would have to watch his/her videos, see some of his/her other recommendations, or perhaps be familiar with him/her offline. Awesome_Mae’s FAQ suggests that some of the users on AMV.org might know each other outside of cyberspace and therefore have experiences together that cannot be ascertained by strictly reading online posts. If it is true that TiptoQRD and Kamikita know each other offline, they might be sharing a joke that is only understood by the two of them. No amount of searching the forum would reveal any insight.

In the same conversation thread as this inside joke, UnhappyPainter and Morphling also make a jokes – ones that would be more understandable to someone new to the community, but knowledgeable of anime:

Morphling: is it still funny to say boku no pico? (Oct, 2015).

UnhappyPainter: Yeah no, but theres this new one called Drrragon BALL

Z (Oct, 2015).

Joking online is different than joking in face to face communication. While users use symbols such as ROFL (i.e., Rolling on the Floor Laughing) or LOL (i.e., Laughing out Loud) to convey laughter, the way to tell if a joke is really funny is when users continue to remake the joke.

Because users sometimes reference a joke that appeared on a different conversation thread, it can very hard for someone new to the community to understand the humor (Hübler & Bell, 2003; Paechter, 2012). Morphling’s choice of the word “still” hints at a joke on AMV.org that might have been funny at one time, but would take some thread searching to understand.

However, Boku no Pico is an anime those who are familiar with the practice might know well (Boku no Pico). This indicates there are jokes that outsiders can understand without having

a deep knowledge of the community. Take the example of UnhappyPainter's joke about Dragon Ball Z. This Anime was first released in America in 1996 and is an iconic series in the world of Anime (Dragon Ball Z). A user with a basic knowledge of anime would be able to get this joke quite easily and have a head start in understanding and becoming part of the community. There might also be an openness to the community's humor, because Awesome_Mae makes it clear that new users are invited to ask about the jokes when they do not understand them.

As these examples illustrate, humor can be used as gatekeeping device signifying who is on the outside and who is on the inside of the community (Ziv, 1984). It can serve as a way of aligning the group as they build comradery by playing off each other's jokes (Paechter 2012), and it can create unity between specific users as they share jokes that even others in the community might not be able to understand (Hübler & Bell, 2003). However, there might also be jokes those on the outside can understand with some knowledge of the practice. In addition, while there are those who might enjoy keeping the jokes within the community, if the community is large enough there might be at least a few users who are willing to explain jokes so an outsider can integrate into the community.

Jargon. Jargon is insider language that develops as users interact with each other on a regular basis. Generally, jargon takes the form of shorthand so users can interact more effectively and exchange ideas without having to spell out what they mean (Paechter 2012). In order to learn from others users must understand this jargon. In the same vein as the jokes, there are two types that seem to be common in AMV.org: website specific jargon and jargon about the practice. Website specific jargon is seen in this conversation thread where Megaboy000 uses acronyms to describe what s/he wants information about:

I know there's a topic about this already out there but this would help me out a lot. Just list what I can do to make a good MEP, please. I really want to manage a good MEP, one that all can enjoy. If you need something to look at, please look at the SR-71 MEP and the Naruto Filler MEP. Thank you for all that help (Oct, 2006).

MissionYTZ is one of many users who help by giving insight, and s/he repeats the same acronym:

I would also suggest you compress it as much as you can without taking away from the quality. I'm already dreading that with my MEP. I would also try and make flexible deadlines, along with easy technical things that are easily understood (Oct, 2006).

Users on AMV.org have developed verbal shortcuts and acronyms to make it easier to communicate with each other about the practice and community. Being able to understand the jargon and then use it in a conversation identifies a user as part of the community. Paechter (2012) found that the users in the online community she studied would rarely stop to explain themselves as they used this language, and others would be unlikely to ask for an explanation. Thus, when someone used jargon, they demonstrated that they had indeed done their research. When Megaboy000 posts s/he fully expects others to understand what s/he means by MEP, it is not hard to understand why because the forum section is referred to as "Multi Editor Projects." There were other areas on the website where jargon explanation was evident as well. For example, on the opinion exchange section there is a text box at the beginning of the forum that explains how "1:1" means a one-to-one opinion exchange and "WIP" means work in progress. This makes it much easier for users to become educated about the website specific jargon integrate themselves into the community without others helping them.

The other kind of jargon commonly used on AMV.org was video editing terminology. In a section of the forum devoted to the technical aspects of video creation, users display an

understanding for jargon associated with video editing. These users point to a good editing guide, though they think it is a little long:

Plunkfishy: Congratulations on an amazing and more complete guide.. Having everything from ripping a dvd to avisynth to first things you need to know about editing in one guide is so much better for a newcomer to the hobby, I remember looking through separate guides for each thing was not the easiest task and though I haven't read through the whole thing now (I might later today) it seems very well done (Nov, 2008).

DinoMan1245: I appreciate this guide. It all seems pretty intimidating at first but most likely very doable if I pace myself. (Apr, 2015)

Other users in this conversation display a knowledge of what the terms mean:

LanternAmigo: I think the latest Perian is having issues with huffys in FCP; mine was crashing almost every time I tried to scrub across them. I might revert a version or just edit on my Windows box until the next version, but it's something to be aware of (Nov, 2008).

BigNintendo: Happened with me too, I just searched for an older version of Perian and reinstalled (Nov, 2008)

This type of jargon appeared to be a little harder to understand than the website specific jargon, as understanding it involved reading a long guide explaining what the terms meant.

McDonnell, Barker, & Wieman (2016) found that when students in an undergrad biology class were exposed to jargon before simpler terms, their retention rates and ability to articulate the ideas decreased. Hence, if a user did not know the jargon it would be essential for new users to read the guide before getting into the conversation thread. In the conversation between LanternAmigo and BigNintendo, both users display a genuine understanding of the topic of Perian and huffys. The conversation would be hard to follow for new editors because members use unexplained jargon throughout. DinoMan1245 states that the guide is intimidating, but doable. Plunkfishy points out that the guide is a little long, but beneficial for a new comer.

Although the guide is touted as newcomer friendly, both users suggest there is a learning curve to understand the technical aspects of editing. A user with previous experience would be able to integrate themselves more easily into the community, than less-experienced others (Paechter, 2012).

Jargon on AMV.org was both online specific (jargon that included phrases like MEP and 1:1) and practice specific (jargon that included video editing terminology). Website specific jargon on AMV.org was more easily understood due to the rules (some of which translated commonly used jargon) outlined on each forum. Practice-specific jargon was harder because of the video editing terminology used (McDonnell et al., 2016). It seems that to understand the video editing jargon on AMV.org, users would need either previous knowledge of video editing or they would need to spend some time reading one of the lengthy guides. As Paechter (2012) suggests, knowing the language allows users to identify with the community and become part of the culture, giving them the ability to communicate and interact more easily with other members. Learning the technical jargon might be more challenging for someone with no editing experience; but if someone entered the community with experience, they could assimilate faster.

Summary

Mutual engagement involved questions asked and answered and stories that bonded users together. In order to learn more about making anime music videos, users would ask questions and, in doing so, they spent time socializing. By answering questions in groups, users collaboratively produced better answers than any one user could provide. Storytelling was also evident on AMV.org, as users bonded around a user who was dealing with copyright issues. Users were more likely to share stories because they were excited or frustrated about the subject.

Joint enterprise was enacted in the form of negotiation, accountability, and discussions on flaming. There were instances where users could not agree on a topic or debated the placement of a resource in a guide. As users shared their opinions, their ideas converged, causing more bonding and creating a group-learning experience. Accountability involved holding each other responsible, and although flaming was generally discouraged on AMV.org, the lack of a clear definition might have made it harder for users to fight against subtler forms of flaming.

Shared repertoire took many forms on AMV.org including tools, jokes, and jargon. User created tools are a sign of an active community, but they must be continually updated to be useful. Jokes were also quite common on AMV.org. Jokes can act as gate keeping device, as well as a way to bond socially. On the other hand, some of the jokes could actually be understood by an outsider, which would allow them to integrate themselves into the community more easily. In the same vein, jargon was split into terms directly associated with the website and language that would be familiar to someone who had worked with video editing software before. The community specific language would be easier to understand than the video editing software language, which would make it easier for newcomers to situate themselves in the community.

As these findings demonstrate, mutual engagement, joint enterprise, and shared repertoire were enacted in various ways on AMV.org. While these communication behaviors are an important part of peer-to-peer learning, there is also another factor that needs to be examined: social status.

Chapter 4: Social Status on AMV.org

Social status is recognized as an integral part of CoP theory (Wenger, 1998, Wenger et al, 2002), and there are many ways it might be enacted and gained in online and offline CoPs. Legitimate Peripheral Participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998) is an important aspect of social status as it refers to how a member is situated within the community. Peripherality refers to newcomers being given a chance by the more experienced users to be involved and learn the practice of the community. It is a newcomer's introduction to the community and how it operates. Legitimacy refers to the act of being recognized as part of and accepted into the community. To become a part of the community "newcomers must be granted enough legitimacy to be treated as potential members" (Wenger, 1998, p. 101). This study found a variety of ways in which users gained status on AMV.org including being brought into the community after lurking, and obeying and/or breaking norms. It also found that users enacted social status by mentioning previous experience; having a tone of confidence; demonstrating experience through tool creation; and being granted moderator or admin status.

Lurking and Peripherality

Online CoPs offer a unique advantage to new users because they are able to stay on the periphery of the community and observe without making their presence known. However, it might be a less satisfying experience because members do not feel like an official part of the community because a user who stays on the periphery and never posts is limited to simply staying on the edge of the community (Nonnecke et al., 2006; Shafie et al., 2016). For new users to gain social status and be integrated into the community, experienced users must acknowledge their presence and interact with them (Wenger,

1998). More experienced users on AMV.org seemed to have an awareness that new users needed to be treated differently and lurking needed to be facilitated to a certain extent. However, these nurturing actions might not always occur because of an expectation that new members needed to ask for help.

AMV.org seems to have its share of lurkers, but Shadimaria questions how easy it is to learn when knowing where to begin is unclear:

I am literally thinking back to when I first joined, and remembering all the frustration of finding relevant information, and filtering out all the crap to find the stuff that actually mattered. I don't want anyone else to have to go through that. So I think by putting this together and making it more visible, new members would know where to look first; because as it is right now, there is no starting point. I mean, where do you begin? You just lurk the forums for years before you know how things work? That's bullshit. Just because we had to do it, doesn't mean new members have to do it too (Jun, 2012).

“Newbies” would revealed themselves by literally saying “Hi, I’m new” or “I just started making AMVs” and then ask for help or feedback. For example, CookinFog seems very lost and lets everyone know it:

I've done something wrong and I came here, I cant find anywhere to teach me how to forum. I've read the rules but whats an org link? i barely know what lmao means. And the work everybody does here is amazing and I need to catch up with the lingo, otherwise nobody's going to want to play with cloudy =[It would be real helpfull if i knew how youguys got your box at the bottom...(Sep, 2014).

A more experienced user named Kinnaka seems to take pity on the user and helps CookinFog by pointing him/her to a place where s/he can get assistance:

Basically, you make an entry in the a-m-v.org catalog. You start here: www.animemusicvideos.org/members by entering a new video. You don't have to upload here if you don't want, but it will help you get feedback (Sep, 2014).

It seems at one time the community was not as “newbie” friendly as it could have been. Even though it does have many guides, Shadimaria alludes to the fact that the

website had nothing akin to a table of contents for a long time, which made it challenging for new comers to navigate the community. Online community spaces that facilitate users' ability to find information without asking and easy access to overviews of discussions can lead to increased satisfaction in the community (Nonnecke et al., 2006). This, in turn, increases the likelihood the lurkers will stay and eventually become posters. CookinFog is a good example of someone who seemed to lurk for a while, but eventually needed guidance. Users such as this might begin by strictly observing, but eventually they need to be given access to all parts of the practice (i.e., mutual engagement, joint enterprise, and shared repertoire) to excel (Wenger, 1998).

It seems more experienced users on AMV.org do have an awareness of the process a “newbie” would need to go through in order to gain experience. For example, when talking about making a good MEP, Xodzu recognizes new comers need special treatment:

Ya know, it really does depend on what you're doing and how good the members are...if you have some less experienced people you're going to have to hold their hands while if you have experienced editors you could probably get away with 'Here's the theme. Here's the technical details. Here's the deadline. Let me know when you're done' (Oct 28, 2006).

Springer echoes Xodzu's post in a discussion thread focused on the etiquette of criticism. S/he comments on how new editors need to be treated differently and points out that experts do not always help “newbies” unless there is a call for help:

I definitely approach the work of a new editor differently than anyone who I know has been around the hobby for a while, and I certainly go about responding to their work in a different way than I would with someone who's been around here for a while... I'd love to help other editors improve, but unless it's someone specifically asking for help or advice, I've found that doesn't always play out like I'd hope (Dec 29, 2015).

Both Springer, and Xodzu discuss how to incorporate “newbies” into the fold by pointing out they need to be treated differently. In this way users with more expertise seem to be figuring out what new comers need to learn in order to make good music videos and grow in the practice. Thus, they seem to enact Vygotsky’s concept of the zone of proximal development (ZPD), where teachers must identify paths that will lead to increased student learning (Gredler, 2009). However, there also appears to be an expectation that “newbies” will ask for help. Xodzu points out that “newbies” do require energy because the practice must be brought down to their level, Springer makes it clear that s/he does not want to spend energy on someone who is not willing to learn. The more experienced users in Grey’s (2004) study were quite willing to bring new users up to their level and bring them into the community. The findings in this study offer a different viewpoint, suggesting that for “newbies” to be offered legitimacy there must be a willingness for more experienced users to spend the energy to help them. However, this might not occur unless the “newbie” reaches out and asks for help. This is more in alignment with Burnett and Bonnici’s (2003) finding that more experienced users expect “newbies” to do some reading before they seek guidance, therefore saving energy and time.

So the AMV.org community offers both a confirmation and a twist in previous findings about the connection between lurking and social status. Lurking offers “newbies” the opportunity to stay on the edge of the community and learn without making themselves known (Grey, 2004). However, to begin to be integrated into the community they must interact with others. When “newbies” reveal themselves, more

expert users might teach them by answering questions and/or allowing them to participate in the practice alongside them. (Shafie et al., 2016). Overall, this suggests that new users cannot integrate themselves without help from more experienced users (Wenger, 1998). However, integration does require energy and more experienced users might not always be enthusiastic to help unless the “newbies” ask for assistance.

Norms

Implicit norms are the unspoken rules created from within the group, not imposed by outside forces. New users have been known to jump right in without lurking, therefore violating the community’s norms because of their ignorance (Burnett & Bonnici, 2003). Explicit norms are more official rules and are generally laid out in FAQ documents written by website admins (Petric & Petrovcic, 2014). Users might display how much experience they have by how well they adhere to the norms of the community and their ability to enforce them (Goldberg & Mackness, 2009). Some of the implicit norms that have been identified in the literature include: identifying as self taught (Lange, 2014), downplaying expertise (Boven, 2014), and reciprocity (Stewart, 2005; Beacom et al., 2015). AMV.org has a number of major implicit norms and one explicit norm. The explicit norm was simply do not talk about places to get illegal Anime footage and offered nothing interesting to the discussion. On the other hand the implicit norms offer more insight into how users enacted social status. The implicit norms included: giving constructive feedback, and being involved with the community before critiquing it. Although this is by no means a comprehensive list of implicit norms occurring on AMV.org, it gives an overview of ways they might be enforced and discussed.

One of the major implicit norms on AMV.org was to give constructive feedback. There is a whole conversation devoted to the “etiquette of criticism” where users discuss this topic. As part of the discussion, Ndgold makes the point that unconstructive comments are not useful:

Honestly, as an artist I'm always open to criticism and love it when my works are torn apart. I've developed a thick skin from years of fiction writing and author clubs and groups. I see a lot of new editors, especially back in the day, who get offended by negative reviews because they cannot separate themselves from their works and just want quick gratification. I admit, I was like that at first. But I grew out of that fairly quickly. I can't stand 'I like it' or 'I hate it' comments as they really mean nothing to me. Why did you hate it? Why did you like it? A lot of my friends that's all I can get from them when I make videos and show it to them and really that doesn't help me improve or learn (Jan, 2016).

Sipboo echoes this sentiment by saying constructive criticism helped him/her learn how to be a better video editor:

It is important to criticism to be constructive! Springer and others critique on my last project really taught me a lot and made me know what was wrong with my stuff. Sure hearing some negative stuff hurts but it is sometimes necessary. Overall feedback on this forum really pushes me to try harder and try to have less 'mistakes' (Dec, 2015).

Sometimes users do not follow this norm and get gently chided for simply leaving a short, undetailed comment. For example, Sunlessday seems to be excited about reviewing

KellMoondust 34576's video, but is reminded that comments should have more depth to them:

Sunlessday: :) I just watched yours the other day. I found it in the announcement thread and said something about loving old-school. I will download it to watch it full quality and have your review soon EDIT: Your review is up (Apr, 2015).

KellMoondust 34576: Oh so you were the quick comment that was left behind. Okay. Well I'll download yours tonight and give it a watch. My reviews normally are detailed (Apr, 2015).

In the discussion of constructive criticism, members acknowledge their desire for this norm to be followed. Implicit norms might be easier to identify when users engage in what are

called “meta-discussions” where the conversation “is devoted to the dynamics of interaction itself, and to the intricacies of propriety and acceptable behavior” (Burnett & Bonnici, 2003, p. 342). Sometimes implicit norms such as this are eventually added to a FAQ document and solidified as an explicit norm of the website, but many times there are too many interpretations of the norm(s) for it to be clear how it should be followed (Burnett & Bonnici, 2003). Users on AMV.org seem to agree that constructive feedback is an important norm to follow, but do not seem to be able to agree on how it should be followed. This lack of a solid interpretation means that it would be unlikely to become an explicit norm and would be unclear to “newbies” entering the community. KellMoondust 34576 seems to realize this, as s/he does not blatantly come out and say that longer constructive comments are the rule, but instead demonstrates the norm by saying “my reviews normally are detailed” and then leading by example.

Although gentle chiding was one way the community enforced implicit norms, there were also instances where the enforcement was not so gentle. For example, Gt54785 rants against the contests on AMV.org, but other users do not take Gt54785 seriously because they rebuke him/her:

Gt54785: Contest contest contest everywhere... no rotoscoping? You are out! no multi anime? You are out! story too simple? You are out! no ugly flares? You are out! You see, big contests have started to look ugly with so called pro-people taking over them. They just butcher every fucking thing about the fun part of amateur movie making (no you noob, not a ref to movie maker). This is just video montage! Why so the obsession of not wanting local contestants at it? Stop thinking of your amv maker family and just open yourselves to something else than your fucking teams or studios! (Nov, 2015)

Ndgold: hmmm... could have sworn I've given out the best in show award to videos that pretty much contradict the statements in ops post pretty consistently over the years....(Ndgold, Nov, 2015).

Sleepconic: Clearly you need to find better contests. Thankfully, the ones I've been attending don't seem to have the problems you describe. Non-flashy (but still well edited) videos win with fair regularity. Though I haven't much faith that you'll actually read this reply, considering you seem to have waited eight years just to make this one post (Nov, 2015).

When norms are broken, users can be very harsh and critical over something that, to an outsider, is nothing special. This rebuking can often turn into flaming in some websites (Burnett & Bonnici, 2003). When Gt54785 goes on a rant about contests being unfair, s/he seems to violate the norm being an active member of the community before criticizing it. Although direct flaming was generally absent from the conversation, other users did not respond in a supporting manner, instead challenging Gt54785's ideas and also his/her lack of involvement with the community. Sometimes implicit norms might not be identified as such until a user breaks it, as implicit norms can develop when people interact with each other (Preece, 2004). When the other users deal with Gt54785, they might have collectively realized that s/he is breaking a norm by the very fact that they all disagree with Gt54785. As the norm was enforced, the other users seemed to bond together as they defended the contests that occur on AMV.org and shared their own knowledge of the community. Users who have an understanding of community norms can gain prestige. They become the teachers and enforcers who show new members the unspoken rules of community (Preece, 2004). If a user does not have knowledge of these norms and breaks them, they are identified as a "newbie" thus lowering their social status in the community. Sleepconic's jab about Gt54785 not posting for eight years, and the fact that the user is quite ignorant of AMV contests, makes it apparent that Gt54785 has not been an active member of the community and lowers the user's credibility. Other users might see this occurring and be less inclined to work with the transgressor, making him/her more marginalized in the community (Burnett & Bonnici,

2003). Users who are not accepted into the community might be forced to stay on the periphery of community unless they can gain back credibility.

In large part, then, understanding unspoken community norms is an important part of developing social status within a CoP. One way users might learn about this through reading “meta discussions” where users discuss the unspoken rules of the community (Burnett & Bonnici, 2003). However, these norms might not be codified in the FAQ, making it difficult for new users to grasp unless they stumble upon or are directed to the meta-discussion. More experienced users might not be as quick to criticize new members because of this lack of clarity, or they might come down quite hard if there is an apparent lack of commitment on “newbies” part. Users can bond over the enforcement of norms and gain social status as they demonstrate that they are not like the one who broke the implicit norm (Preece, 2004). Breaking a norm in turn lowers one’s social standing as it displays an ignorance of the community’s culture and history.

Identity as Social Status

Although the learning taking place on AMV.org is mainly peer-to-peer (i.e., there are no official teachers) there are ways in which experienced users identify themselves as having social status. Users who have previous experience in the practice can come into the community with a higher social status because they already have pre-existing knowledge structures (Campbell et al., 2009). Goldberg and Mackness (2009) found that users who have technical knowledge of computers and are familiar with online CoPs tend to have higher social status because they can move about more freely and are more accustomed to online communication. CoP theory also recognizes that users gain social status through various acts within the community (Wenger et al.,

2002). User might also gain status because they are able to tell stories that command attention and influence the direction of the community (Moore, 2006). They might also gain status by creating tools such as highly reviewed guides or other useful resources (Beacom et al., 2015). Users on AMV.org might also come into the community with previous experience of video editing, which allows them to situate themselves as knowledgeable members of the community. They can display this expertise by making various guides and resources that are praised by other users. Finally, although users have social status they showed a certain level of humility that might come from a desire to follow an implicit norm of not flaunting knowledge. This study examined two members on AMV.org (Nonkio and Xodzu) who established themselves as knowledgeable members of the community. There are others who appear to be part of a core group, but these two illustrate the ways that social status via identity was enacted on AMV.org.

Nonkio has been around since the founding of AMV.org, and started a running joke about new users getting off her lawn.¹ Nonkio introduces herself in this this quote responding to another user wanting feedback on a video:

Welcome to the org. I am Nonkio, Apple Mac Guru and current proprietor of #amv-review. Okay, I have now watched this video six times, and I've read the thread. So I will offer a little bit of bio info so you know my bias. I am very old school Org. In fact, editing wise, I predate the Org. This means I have not only internalised, but indeed, helped create and propagate the philosophical and stylistic biases that have been brought up by others in this thread, and in general, I stick by them. (tl;dr, you crazy kids, get off my lawn!!! *shakes walker*) (Jun, 2007).

Nonkio explicitly labels herself as a master of the Apple computer and also someone who has been making anime music videos since before the creation of AMV.org. A community member's social status can be affected by their previous experiences outside the community. When members join the community they are not a blank slate, because they

bring in ideas and views about the culture they are entering. This point is echoed in Campbell et al.'s (2009) case study of a nurse joining a local police force. The authors found police of a higher rank deferred to the nurse's medical expertise in certain situations. This in turn enabled her to rise in rank much faster than if she did not have the nursing experience. Although this case study was done in an offline CoP, the same principles can be applied to online communities. Nonkio is someone who knew a lot about anime music videos before she even came to the community. Because she had the skills to jump right in without a steep learning curve, this would give her a head start when it came to her social status on AMV.org,

Another user who attained social status is Xodzu. At the time of this study Xodzu was no longer participating on AMV.org (as indicated by the log in tracker on his profile showing he has not logged in since 2011). Despite his² absence he has left a legacy according to Nonkio:

I think once we lost Xodzu (for the hilariously negative) and quu (for the awesomely positive), I think it was really difficult for me to continue to be part of the community (Dec, 2015).

Xodzu's negativity is displayed in this post where he refers to another user as if he knows them well. Although he insults other users, he mixes helpful tips with his degrading comments:

A pretty early first beta deadline. Explicitly state you don't expect a full video but rather just enough that you can judge if you want their track to go in or not. Anyone who looks like they're doing an interesting segment stays in and anyone who looks like they're pulling a sierra lorna/silvermoon by just tossing pointless effects on top of a soulless video gets the ax (Jun, 2007).

Part of the Xodzu's reputation is denying that he is helpful, even though he created a guide called "So You Want to Be A *GOOD* Anime Music Video Editor," which received positive feedback:

Feel free to discuss montage theory if you like and I may roll it in, personally I don't know enough about that to do it justice. Film ain't my thing, you'll notice

most of that part actually originates from theories about still images like paintings but can be applied to video. Glad to know some people are thinking about that part though... As for earning most helpful, why is everyone stabbing me in the back like this? Come on, I did just release a how to be an asshole guide as well (which, incidentally, has more replies. Apparently you people are more interested in being assholes than being good editors. Granted that's not all that surprising). What more does a man have to do to protect his reputation? (Feb, 2009).

Nonkio also made a guide and other users respect her advice. BigNintendo makes this plain:

BigNintendo: I edited a school project with huffys in FCP6, I ran into the same issue and I couldn't get the finished video to compress with Compressor. I told my teacher and he said that the only thing FCP can edit with is MOV or else you will run into issues. Wait for what Kio has to say though (Nov, 2008).

Paechter (2012) discovered that more experienced users develop a tone of "increasingly confident authority" (p. 400) that grows as other users acknowledge their contributions. Xodzu seems confident that he can make fun of others without worrying about repercussions, and he talks about other users as if he knows them and is familiar with their work. Xodzu is the kind of member other users might love or hate. He is praised for the guide he created, yet he also takes jabs at other users. Nonkio is also praised for her guide, but tends to take a gentler approach to her responses. Both of them display confidence in the practice of remixing and also their role in the community. Beacom et al. (2015) found that users who created tools and had them positively reviewed were more likely to have high status. Xodzu and Nonkio interacted with other users in the conversations about their guides by contributing more insights. They also accepted praise from other users. Preece (2004) suggests that knowledge is the main commodity within an online community. Lin and Chiou (2010) concurred, stating that knowledge contribution is an important part of online social status and is determined by "what you give away, not what you control" (p. 8). Xodzu and Nonkio both seem to put a lot of energy into their guides, and their extensive knowledge of making anime music videos enabled them to command more respect from those

who sought information. In turn, these guides are a way “newbies” can begin to learn how to create good music videos, building their own social status as they do so (Lange, 2014).

So users on AMV.org can raise their social status in multiple ways. Those who are new to the community, but have previous experience in the practice, might be able to gain social status very quickly (Campbell et al., 2009). Because Nonkio joined AMV.org with previous editing experience she likely already had social status when she entered the community. Users might also display experience by their confident attitudes (Paechter, 2012). Even though he had a reputation for being negative, Xodzu seemed confident in his actions, causing other users to respect him despite the negativity. In addition, Xodzu seemed to build social status interpersonally through humorous and entertaining interaction styles. Users might also gain social status by making a useful tool such as a guide (Beacom et al., 2015). Both Xodzu and Nonkio evolved their social status through a high level of interaction and sharing their knowledge with others through the creation of guides. Nonkio also has another way she could display her social status if she desired because besides just being intellectual, she is also a moderator.

Institutional Social Status

So far this study has only concentrated on more unofficial forms of social status (i.e., social status that users have earned through expertise and knowledge sharing). However, the literature suggests that online communities might ascribe social status in a more formal way. Websites might be structured in such a way that users are given status in the form reputation meters that measure the quality and quantity of their posts (Rosenbaum & Shachaf, 2010). Users are also given privileged spots in the social structure of the community by being assigned the

title of moderator or admin. Moderators are those in charge of the daily business of the community, which includes facilitating discussions and removing posts when necessary (Butler et al., 2007). Moderators might be new to the community, but have previous experience moderating, or they might be volunteers chosen from the more experience members of the community (Pisa, 2014). Admins are a step above the moderators and have the most control. Generally, the creator of the community is an admin, and she/he raises up other users to their level or removes them when needed (Holmes & Cox, 2011). Although admins are generally focused on the behind-the-scenes work of running the community, they might also participate socially, especially when the community is small in size (Butler et al., 2007). The main focus of this section will be on mods and admins of AMV.org and how their presence and social status affected peer-to-peer learning.

Here MissionY TZ interviews Yamazaki and they discuss how mods have a green user name and what the job of a moderator entails:

MissionY TZ: From the green of your name, many here know you as a moderator for the a-m-v.org forums. Care to let us know your favorite thing about the job? The least favorite? The one thing you'd LOVE to tell people that might make your job easier? (Sep, 2012).

Yamazaki: 95% of what I do here is basically janitorial work on the forums: banning spambots (which regular members will almost never even see and that makes us moderators proud!), renaming threads, moving posts, replying to requests for site help from "newbie"s, etc. etc. This might sound like a lot of work, but it's not. It's just a regular chore that works into my .org-browsing routine pretty easily. 4% of my work is essentially as community mediator. This means that I talk to members and to other moderators when problems, disagreements and misunderstandings pop up in the community. Not every problem can be solved with an insta-ban, and sometimes shutting down a thread and pretending it didn't happen is the worst thing a moderator can do (Sep, 2012).

Mods on AMV.org could also be identified through looking at a list entitled “The Team” or they might reveal themselves as a mod in a conversation. Here Nem-bo Studios reveals his/her role as a mod to correct another user’s misinformation:

AtticusEaster: plus this sites been like this since the year 2000 i doubt their ever going to update it, fans of the site need to understand, that the mods need help on the new layout, the mods are only here to check for problems, i doubt they know how to code shit for a layouts, i use to know how to setup a layout for the old old way youtube and myspace had, alot of it was copy and paste what ever code you wanted to the right section ether if its a moving pic in a title or a new background...(Nov, 2015).

Nem-bo Studios: Sorry, but as a mod (which you might've missed) let me assure you that we have people who work on it and who know a lot about writing the web. And I mean that in a way more advanced meaning than writing a layout to a YouTube or MySpace indeed 🤖 But of course, inputs are always welcomed - I was mostly just saying it so you aren't let down when the new stuff comes (even if it seems unlikely) and you don't have any Luffy on the main page 😊 (Nov, 2015).

Mods are in charge of governing and facilitating the day to day discussion of the community (Pisa, 2014) and they have social status because of their behind the scenes knowledge and the ability to change and delete quotes. However, the mods on AMV.org did not flaunt their status. All eight of the moderators had a variety of banners and tag lines, but nothing on their signature to indicate their social status. Nonetheless like the Q&A websites studied by Rosenbaum and Shachaf (2010), AMV.org does attach ranking signifiers to moderators in the form of a green user name. However, the only place this is explained is in a note at the bottom of the forum page. While users do notice the color signifier, the conversation between Nem-bo Studios and AtticusEaster reveals it might not be easy for a “newbie” to tell who is a mod.

This might allow mods on AMV.org to be involved in the conversations and blend into the community as regular users (unless they chose to reveal their status). Moderators are essential to running an online community of practice, yet if they are not careful, their leadership

roles can effect users sense of belonging and group identity if they get too involved with the community (Petric & Petrovic, 2014). So by keeping a low profile, moderators might have a better chance of blending into the community and having a positive influence on any social learning taking place (Gray, 2004). Not having the hindrance of a title allows moderators to interact with other users seemingly on a peer-to-peer basis, but if need be, a moderator could reveal herself/himself in order to deal with a situation where authority is needed.

Moderators are by no means the most powerful users in a community because they still have a boss: the admin. There were five admins on AMV.org at the time of this writing and two of them identified themselves as such. Phade is the creator AMV.org and has the words “site admin” under his avatar. Another admin named GloryQuester has a place on his/her profile where it indicates s/he is a “Moderation Hero” and an “Administrator, AnimeMusicVideos.Org.” One conversation between Trivex and Phade gives a good example of the job of an admin and how they are recognized as having status. In this conversation Phade the admin is directly addressed by Trivex and he³ responds sternly, but also kindly:

Trivex: If I could get some sort of coherent response to my last post, that'd be appreciated. Or do I need to post captioned images or meme in order to get any kind of response? Seeing as that seems to be the way these things work around here lately. Now we wait 😊 (May, 2015).

Phade: Well, you are asking for minutia details on what is going to happen and doing so in a quite accusational tone. Neither of these invite a warm or timely response. However, regardless of what has happened in the past, I can assure you that we are making actual progress now. One thing that I am reviewing this weekend is distributed project management packages so that everyone will know openly what is going on and who is responsible for doing each piece... As for everything else, things should be clear when the project management package is in place... If you would like to help, you could help us review project management packages... 😊 Thanks and again and have a great day! ^_^ (May, 2015).

Trivex: A progress bar with milestones for possible server configurations and what benefits they have for the site as a whole. Might push people to drop that extra cash if "x" feature is only a few hundred away. Anything to make the donation drive a little more tangible for the average user. (May, 2015)

Here, Phade describes how he is reviewing the management packages and coordinating everyone's job in the project. This conversation also displays a social aspect of the admin's role, as Phade must deal with Trivex's accusatory attitude. Phade admonishes Trivex, but ends the post in a cordial manner with a smile emoji and an invitation to help. This social aspect of admins was also found by both Butler et al. (2007) and Holmes and Cox (2011), who discovered that admins might encourage user participation, moderate conversations, and post messages. However, Butler et al. (2007) only sampled from a number of small communities where the admins were the only user governance. Holmes and Cox (2011) did study of admins did include moderators, but they hardly interacted with the community at all. This meant that the admin's interaction was essential to effectively guide the community. Because AMV.org has a large group of moderators for the day-to-day governing of the community, admins could step back and handle website management.

It seems admins are still quite active in this community, though. This interaction is a good thing (Holmes & Cox, 2011), as communities might thrive or die depending on the level of interaction of the admin(s). However, interaction might not be enough to sustain a positive learning atmosphere if there is trouble behind the scenes. For instance, Awesome_Mae celebrates becoming an admin, but a little more than three years later s/he resigns:

Awesome_Mae: I'm now an admin as opposed to just a mod so If you need anything then feel free to hit me up (Dec, 2013).

Awesome_Mae: No matter how much I love this community and its members I can not deal with the behind the scenes pettiness anymore. While I know certain

parties will be disappointed in me, I can't take this toxic atmosphere. I've hit my limit and while the last straw was a small one, it's the one that broke the camel's back. I've been told many times that stepping down is selfish and will have a negative impact on the community and while I've honestly never seen myself as that important, I do sincerely apologize for what I'm doing. As I said, this really does break my heart to do but I'm doing this for my own emotional wellness (Mar, 2016).

Trivex's response to Phade's plan to get AMV.org redesigned adds insight into behind the scenes activities:

It's a combination of some members of the administration leaving and the remaining stonewalling people asking questions or trying to get work done. And frankly also your absence throughout the years that's made people skeptical about any work being done. If you step of to the plate I take no issue with any of this, thus far you've proven yourself more than willing and capable in your responses. Same can't be said for everyone on the administration though, but that's just my 2 cents as someone who's been tossed nothing but scraps over the years (May, 2015).

Other users indicated they were aware that admins have power over the content of the website.

Take the example of how Shadimaria talks about the power of admins to post "stickies"

Shadimaria: because if there is one thing people should see when they first join the Org, I think it would be this list. That way people know where to look for information, without having to track down all the stickies themselves and read them; then filter out all the unnecessary ones in the process... But I think the admin is still deciding what to do with this list. Because it could potentially replace a lot of stickies that seem unnecessary, which would make a lot more work for them too (Jun, 2012).

There appears to be problems behind the scenes, and not everyone is happy with the leadership on AMV.org. As Awesome_Mae points out "the atmosphere is toxic" and Shadimaria seems to be a little unhappy with the leadership by implying they do not want to do the extra work necessary for "newbies" to learn. Admins act as gatekeepers to what is allow to become a "sticky" (posts, guides and lists that stay on top of a forum section page no matter who else posts). Because user-created guides are an important part of learning the practice (Lange, 2014),

this power allows admins to either enhance or inhibit social learning depending on how they approach their role. Awesome_Mae's departure from his/her admin status also points to how the admins can inhibit or facilitate learning. It seems by letting the environment get too toxic, the admins on AMV.org might have discouraged learning in the sense that they drove Awesome_Mae to give up his/her role as a moderator and, therefore, limited his/her ability to be a teacher and guide (Gairín-Sallán, Rodríguez-Gómez, & Armengol-Asparó, 2010). Of course it is possible that Awesome_Mae was overly sensitive, but other posts indicate a certain level of dysfunctional leadership. This might cause users to be less engaged with the community because the environment is unpleasant (Leary, Green, Denson, Schoenfeld, Henley, & Langford, 2013). Navas et al. (2014) referred to remixing culture as a "Do-ocracy" because it does not have an official government. The very fact that there is a governing body on AMV.org might cause some of the users to be resentful of how much the admins are involved with the community or even that there is a governing body to begin with.

The moderator's job is to facilitate and regulate discussion in the online community. They are also tasked with the day to day governing of the website and the removal of content if necessary (Pisa, 2014). In order not to stifle users' sense of virtual community, a moderator must take the time to understand the culture (Grey, 2004). Although there were a couple of ways users could identify who was in leadership, the moderators on AMV.org appeared to be able to interact with other users as peers because their official social status was not explicitly known. Admins are the highest leaders of the community, but might also interact with the community in a social manner. They are the gatekeepers of the community and have the ability to decide who gets to be an admin or moderator, and what resources are prominently displayed. With this power they can

encourage or discourage learning depending on how they manage the community (Butler et al., 2007). Admins on AMV.org were easier to identify than the moderators because many identified themselves. Although AMV.org is quite large and there were plenty of moderators to do to the daily work of the community, they still interacted with users at a social level (Holmes & Cox, 2011). This might be beneficial at a certain level, but the evidence from several conversations indicates the environment behind the scenes might have been toxic. If the leadership is dysfunctional, this might discourage users from engaging with the community (Leary et al., 2013), and inhibit user's ability to learn from each other because admins have the power to add and remove guides.

Summary

“Newbies” might begin lurking as a way to familiarize themselves with the community, but then need help from more experience users to become more integrated into the community. Some of the experienced users indicated they would help newcomers only if they were asked for help. “Newbies” might also need help understanding the implicit norms that were identified on AMV.org. Sometimes the more experienced users would be gentle in their enforcement, but other times they could be harsher depending on the norm. Users who understood the implicit norms and followed them were more likely to have higher social status, while those who did not follow them might be forced to stay on the periphery of community. More experienced users could be identified by the knowledge they brought into the community from the outside, but also from the knowledge they displayed when they made useful tools such as guides. Finally, social status could be gained from being a mod or admin. However, a mod's social status was not as blatant as an admin's and they could more easily roam the community and engage with members. Admins

on the other hand are more conspicuous and if not careful they can negatively affect social learning through improper handling of the website or toxic leadership.

It is clear from these findings that social status might have both a positive and negative impact on peer-to-peer learning in AMV.org. The following chapter concludes this paper by reviewing the motivation for this study, method limitations and strengths, and three key findings of this research.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

Far from being a new phenomenon, peer-to-peer learning in communities of practice has been around for centuries. With the onset of high speed internet and web 2.0 technology, people from all over the world can now form online communities and collaborate without ever meeting face to face. Because the internet offers users the ability to view archived content, lurk, and interact, it offers new opportunities for researchers to discover how peer-to-peer learning and social status work in online learning communities.

One framework that has been used to study online communities is CoP theory (Wenger, 1998). CoP theory posits that learning is situational in nature and members of the community learn while they are jointly engaged in a practice. This theory is primarily focused on social interactions in learning communities and less on learning processes (such as information acquisition and recall). It is useful in examining how new members enter and become integrated into the community; the role of social status in the interactions of vets and “newbies”; describing how members take on roles and enforce rules; and how members apply information learned in the practice. It is less useful in describing the mental processes of how information is acquired and retained. Thus, it is not so much a theory of how learning takes place in the individual, but of the learning behaviors enacted in social interaction.

One area that has not had been studied using CoP theory, is communities focused on remixing. Remixing has also been around for centuries, but has gained interest in the 21st century because of the way a unique culture has sprung up around this practice. The way remixing culture is described as a peer driven do-ocracy in the literature (Navas et al., 2015), makes it ripe for further study using CoP as a theoretical framework. AMV.org is an excellent community to

study the unique attributes of remixing culture, as well as the communication behaviors outlined in CoP theory. AMV.org has a domain of interest (remixing anime and music) that keeps the members together and gives them commonality. It also has a devoted community of members that continually interact around the shared practice of creating anime music videos. Throughout these interactions, members enact many of the communication behaviors categorized by CoP (i.e., mutual engagement, joint enterprise, and shared repertoire).

An observational Netnography (Kozinets, 2010; Kozinets, 2015) method was used to study AMV.org. This method involves the researcher simply staying in the background of the community and analyzing user interactions. While this inhibits the researcher from asking questions or studying communication in private messages, studying peer-to-peer learning in this manner has been shown to be effective because researchers can observe learning as it is occurring (Ziegler et al., 2014). This method is also qualitative in nature, so the findings of this study are not generalizable to other online communities. Many of these communication behaviors are grounded in previous research, though, so it is likely they will also be observed in other online communities. In addition, because the goal of this study is to understand peer-to-peer learning and social status in a particular online community (and not calculate the mean), this method is sufficient. Finally, this type of study comprises getting data strictly from an online community, as a result it is not as holistic as a study that examines people's lives on and off and the internet (e.g., Ito et al., 2008). However, due to the fact that this study focuses mainly on online interactions and learning, it is not crucial to observe people outside of their virtual communities (Flick, 2014). In summary, the limitations presented do not prevent the current study from being methodologically sound for its intended purpose.

These observational methods have yielded several significant findings about the AMV.org community that have significant implications for the study of peer-based, online learning. The first key finding is that the communication behavior of user responsibility (or lack thereof) is an important part of either facilitating or inhibiting peer-to-peer learning in this community. On the whole the users on AMV.org were active in keeping the community functioning and teaching one another how to create good music videos. They answered each other's questions, kept one another on task, negotiated when they disagreed, and generally helped keep guides and links up to date. However, there were signs that responsibility was lacking in several key areas. For example, there was evidence flaming occurred even though it was not as blatant compared to other websites and frowned upon by the leadership. This might have been due the lack of a clear definition of what constitutes flaming. As a result, some users might not want to engage, which in turn, limited their ability to learn from others in the community. Also some of the links might not have been kept as current as they should have been. This led to a number of them pointing to non-existent web pages and limiting their effectiveness as learning tools. These findings extend Rosenbaum and Shachaf's (2010) discovery that accountability involves users negotiating and bonding together to keeping flaming to a minimum. The finding also suggests that further research needs to be done to examine the negative effects of subtle flaming and broken links on peer-to-peer learning.

The second key finding is that the communication behavior of integrating new users into the community is an important part of peer-to-peer learning in this community. This task falls to veteran CoP members, and if experienced users did not handle power well, they can inhibit peer-to-peer learning. New users might begin lurking to understand the practice, but in order to be

more fully integrated into the community they need experienced users to come along side to teach them. New users had to be careful how they made their presence known to the more experienced users or they were liable to break an implicit norm. New users continually enter the AMV.org community, and experienced users realize these “newbies” need to be treated differently. New users were expected to ask for help, though, and this required them to identify those with a greater social status. Users demonstrated their social status through their experience in the practice, the extra influence they had in negotiation, their knowledge of norms, their confident attitudes, the creation of guides, and their moderator or admin status. Users who had admin status had to be careful not to abuse their power. They could inhibit the integration of newcomers into the community by allowing a toxic atmosphere to develop or by placing important guides in less than prominent positions. By extending the concept of Legitimate Peripheral Participation (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998) to include admins and reluctant veterans, these findings add further insights into how new members might be helped or inhibited from being integrated into an online CoP. These findings also extend Butler et al.’s (2007) study of an admin’s part in enhancing community participation by demonstrating the possible negative effects of irresponsible admins. These findings suggest that further research needs to be done regarding the integration of new users into the community and admins’ positive or negative effects on peer-to-peer learning.

The third finding centers on AMV.org’s unique attributes as a CoP focused on the practice of remixing and these attributes’ facilitation of peer-to-peer learning. Because remixers on AMV.org deal with copyrighted works, this causes tension as users attempt to negotiate hazy lines between legal and illegal. However, there are some benefits to this, one of which being

users seem more likely to enact the communication behavior of sharing stories offering empathy and support. This creates an atmosphere where users are more likely to share information and ideas with each other, therefore enhancing peer-to-peer learning. The other attribute that creates a unique peer-to-peer environment on AMV.org is the level of knowledge users possess about multiple aspects of anime music videos. Users must have knowledge about how to edit videos and work with music, but also need to be well versed in anime. This creates situations where users know a lot about one subject, but not another, requiring them to share knowledge with each other. This enables those with previous knowledge of any of these three areas to have a head start integrating into the community. They can contribute something useful to the discussion. These findings echo and extend the research of Jenkins et al. (2006), Ito et al. (2008), and Ito (2010) studies of remixing communities, adding further insight to the unique culture of AMV.org as an online CoP.

In conclusion, if Ithiel de Sola Pool and Marshall McLuhan time traveled into the 21st century and were shown how the Internet allows people to connect and learn from each other via online CoPs, they would likely be amazed at how true their predictions had become. If they were allowed to choose one online community to join and they chose AMV.org, they would encounter a culture of peer-to-peer learning focused on remixing. They might begin integration into the community by lurking the forums, or reveal themselves and have someone come along side them. They might encounter subtle flaming or they might encounter encouragement. They might become experts in remixing, or be content watching other user's creations. Whatever happens, they will have experienced an online CoP that both encourages and constrains peer-to-peer learning.

References

- Atay, A. (2009). Identities in motion: Cyberspace and diasporic queer male bodies in the context of globalization (Order No. 3372507). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (304997968). Retrieved from <http://0-search.proquest.com.library.uark.edu/docview/304997968?accountid=8361>
- Beacom, A. M., Kim, Y., Selby, J. L., Weber, M. S. & Monge, P. (2011). Identifying perceived experts in an Online Community of Practice. *Conference Papers -- International Communication Association*, 1-33.
- Berger, J. (2011). Arousal increases social transmission of information. *Psychological science*, 22, 891-893.
- Black, R. W. (2005). Access and affiliation: The literacy and composition practices of English-language learners in an online fanfiction community. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 49(2), 118-128. doi:10.1598/JAAL.49.2.4
- Boehmer, J. (2015). *The negative effect of flaming on learning from political news online* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 363251).
- Boku no Pico. (n.d.) In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Boku_no_Pico
- Boven, D. T. (2014). "I'm not much of an expert, myself": Situated learning in an informal online community of practice. *E-Learning and Digital Media*, 11, 250-262.
- Bregman, P. (2016). *The Right Way to Hold People Accountable*. Retrieved from <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/how-we-work/201601/the-right-way-hold-people-accountable>
- Burnett, G., & Bonnici, L. (2003). Beyond the FAQ: Explicit and implicit norms in Usenet newsgroups. *Library & Information Science Research* 25, 333-351. doi:10.1016/S0740-8188(03)00033-1
- Butler, B., Sproull, L., Kiesler, S., & Kraut, R. (2008). Community effort in online groups: Who does the work and why? In S. P. Weisband (Ed.), *Leadership at a distance: Research in technologically-supported work* (pp. 171-193). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Campbell, M., Verenikina, I., & Herrington, A. (2009). Intersection of trajectories: A newcomer in a community of practice. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 21, 647-657.
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing Among Five Approaches*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

- Davies, B. (2005). Communities of practice: Legitimacy not choice. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 9, 557-581.
- Dizard, W. P. (2000). *Old Media, New Media: Mass Communications in the Information Age*. New York: Longman.
- Dragon Ball Z. (n.d.) In *Wikipedia*. Retrieved from https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dragon_Ball_Z
- Dubé, L., Bourhis, A., Jacob, R., & Koohang, A. (2006). Towards a typology of virtual communities of practice. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge & Management*, 1, 169-93.
- Evans, C., Yeung, E., Markoulakis, R., & Guilcher, S. (2014). An online community of practice to support evidence-based physiotherapy practice in manual therapy. *Journal of Continuing Education in the Health Professions*, 34, 215-223. doi:10.1002/chp.21253
- Eckert, P., & Wenger, É. (2005). What is the role of power in sociolinguistic variation? *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 9, 582-589. doi:10.1111/j.1360-6441.2005.00307.x
- Everything is a Remix [Video File]. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=d9ryPC8bxqE>
- Ferguson, J., & Taminiau, Y. (2014). Conflict and learning in inter-organizational online communities: Negotiating knowledge claims. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 18, 886-904. doi:10.1108/JKM-06-2014-0248
- Flick, U. (2014). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.
- Gairín-Sallán, J., Rodríguez-Gómez, D., & Armengol-Asparó, C. (2010). Who exactly is the moderator? A consideration of online knowledge management network moderation in educational organisations. *Computers & Education*, 55, 304-312. doi:10.1016/j.compedu.2010.01.016
- Gray, B. (2004). Informal learning in an online community of practice. *Journal of Distance Education*, 19(1), 20-35.
- Gredler, M. E. (2009). *Learning and Instruction: Theory into Practice*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill Pearson.
- Guldberg, K., & Mackness, J. (2009). Foundations of communities of practice: Enablers and barriers to participation. *Journal of Computer Assisted Learning*, 25, 528-538. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2729.2009.00327.x
- Hara, N., Shachaf, P., & Stoerger, S. (2009). Online communities of practice typology revisited. *Journal of Information Science*, 35, 740-757.

- Hendrix, D. M. (2008). *Factors influencing participation in global online communities of practice* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Central; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 332288).
- Hines, C. (2000). *Virtual Ethnography*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Holmes, P., & Cox, A. M. (2011). 'Every group carries the flavour of the admins': leadership on Flickr. *International Journal of Web Based Communities*, 7, 376-391.
- Horowitz, D., & Kamvar, S. D. (2010). The anatomy of a large-scale social search engine: *The 19th International Conference on World Wide Web*, 431-440. Raleigh, NC: ACM.
- Hübler, M. T., & Bell, D. C. (2003). Computer-mediated humor and ethos: Exploring threads of constitutive laughter in online communities. *Computers & Composition*, 20, 277. doi:10.1016/S8755-4615(03)00036-7
- Hung, D. L., & Der-Thanh, C. (2001). Situated Cognition, Vygotskian Thought and Learning from the Communities of Practice Perspective: Implications for the Design of Web-Based E-Learning. *Educational Media International*, 38(1), 3-12. doi:10.1080/09523980110037525
- Hunsinger, J., & Senft, T. M. (2013). *The Social Media Handbook*. New York: Routledge.
- Itō, M., Baumer, S., Bittanti, M., Boyd, D., Cody, R., Herr-Stephenson, B., Horst, H., Lange, P. Mahendran D., Martinez, K., Pascoe, C., Perkel, D., Sims, C., Tripp, L. (2010). *Hanging Out, Messing Around, and Geeking Out: Kids Living and Learning with New Media*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Ito, M., Horst, H., Bittanti, M., Boyd, D., Herr-Stephenson, B., Lange, P. G., & Robinson, L. (2008). *Living and Learning with New Media: Summary of Findings from the Digital Youth Project*. John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation.
- Jane, E. A. (2015). Flaming? What Flaming? The pitfalls and potentials of researching online hostility. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 17(1), 65-87.
- Jenkins, H., Clinton, K., Purushotma, R., Robison, A. J., & Weigel, M. (2006). Confronting the challenges of participatory culture: Media education for the 21st century. *MacArthur Foundation Publication*, 1(1), 1-59.
- Knobel, M., Lankshear, C., & Lewis, M. (2010). AMV Remix: Do-it-yourself anime music videos. In M. Knobel, & C. Lankshear (Eds.), *DIY Media: Creating, Sharing and Learning with New Technologies*, (pp. 205-230). New York: Peter Lang.
- Kollock, P., & Smith, M. A. (1996). Managing the virtual commons: cooperation and conflict in computer communities. In S. Herring (Ed.) *Computer-Mediated*

- Communication: Linguistic, Social and Cross Cultural Perspectives* (pp. 109-128). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kozinets, R. V. (2010). *Netnography: Doing Ethnographic Research Online*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Kozinets, R. V. (2015). *Netnography: Redefined*. Los Angeles: Sage.
- Kozinets, R., Dobeck, P.Y. and Earley, A. (2014). Netnographic Analysis: Understanding Culture through social media data. In U. Flick (Ed.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Data Analysis* (pp.262-276). Los Angeles: Sage.
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lange, P. G. (2014). *Kids on YouTube*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press.
- Leary, T. G., Green, R., Denson, K., Schoenfeld, G., Henley, T., & Langford, H. (2013). The relationship among dysfunctional leadership dispositions, employee engagement, job satisfaction, and burnout. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal*, 16, 112-130. doi:10.1037/h0094961
- Lee, H. (2005). Behavioral strategies for dealing with flaming in an online forum. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 46, 385-403. doi:10.1111/j.1533-8525.2005.00017.x
- Lin, F., & Chiou, G. (2010). Prestige as an indicator of knowledge exchange in the community of school technology coordinators. *Online Information Review*, 34(1), 5-20.
- Markwell, J., & Brooks, D. W. (2002). Broken links: The ephemeral nature of educational WWW hyperlinks. *Journal of Science Education and Technology*, 11, 105-108.
- McDonnell, L., Barker, M. K., & Wieman, C. (2016). Concepts first, jargon second improves student articulation of understanding. *Biochemistry and Molecular Biology Education: A Bimonthly Publication of the International Union of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology*, 44(1), 12-19. doi:10.1002/bmb.20922
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Sourcebook*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Moore, E. (2006). 'You tell all the stories': Using narrative to explore hierarchy within a Community of Practice. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 10, 611-640. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9841.2006.00298.x
- Murillo, E. (2008). Searching Usenet for virtual communities of practice: using mixed methods to identify the constructs of Wenger's theory. *Information Research*, 13(4), 4-40

- Navas, E., Gallagher, O., & Burrough, X. (Eds.). (2014). *Routledge Companion to Remix Studies*. Florence, KY, USA: Taylor and Francis.
- Nonnecke, B., Andrews, D. & Preece, J. (2006) Non-public and public online community participation: needs, attitudes and behavior. *Electronic Commerce Research*, 6(1), 7-20.
- Nielsen, J. (2006). *The 90-9-1 Rule for Participation Inequality in Social Media and Online Communities*. Retrieved from <https://www.nngroup.com/articles/participation-inequality/>
- Paechter, C. (2012). Online learning in divorce: How the formation of a community of practice in a divorce support website enables and inhibits learning. *E-Learning and Digital Media*, 9, 392-405.
- Petric, G., & Petrovic, A. (2014). Elements of the management of norms and their effects on the sense of virtual community. *Online Information Review*, 38, 436-454. doi:<http://dx.doi.org.library.uark.edu/10.1108/OIR-04-2013-0083>
- Pisa, S. S. (2013). *In search of a practice: Large-scale moderation in a massive online community* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (Order No. 3592427).
- Pool, I. S. (1983). *Technologies of Freedom*. Cambridge, Mass: Belknap Press.
- Preece, J. (2004). Etiquette, empathy and trust in communities of practice: Stepping-stones to social capital. *Journal of Universal Computer Science*, 10, 294-302.
- Rosenbaum, H., & Shachaf, P. (2010). A structuration approach to online communities of practice: The case of Q&A communities. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 61, 1933-1944. doi:10.1002/asi.21340
- Shachaf, P. (2010). Social reference: Toward a unifying theory. *Library & Information Science Research*, 32(1), 66-76. Retrieved from <http://0-search.proquest.com.library.uark.edu/docview/57693207?accountid=8361>
- Shafie, L. A., Yaacob, A., & Singh, P. K. (2016). Lurking and L2 learners on a Facebook group: The voices of the invisibles. *English Language Teaching*, 9(2), 1-12.
- Paul Schneider (2011, Aug 11) *Is the 90-9-1 Rule for Online Community Engagement Dead?* [Data][Weblog]. Retrieved from <http://blog.socious.com/bid/40350/Is-the-90-9-1-Rule-for-Online-Community-Engagement-Dead-Data>
- Stedman, K. D. (2012). Remix literacy and fan compositions. *Computers & Composition*, 29(2), 107-123. doi:10.1016/j.compcom.2012.02.002

- Stewart, D. (2005). Social status in an open-source community. *American Sociological Review*, 70, 823-842. doi:10.1177/000312240507000505
- Thomas, A. U., Fried, G. P., Johnson, P., & Stilwell, B. J. (2010). Sharing best practices through online communities of practice: a case study. *Human Resources for Health*, 8, 25-32. doi:10.1186/1478-4491-8-25
- Weber, M. (1922, translated in 1978). *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft* [Economy and Society]. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1981). The instrumental method in psychology. In J. V., Wertsch (Ed.), *The Concept of Activity in Soviet Psychology*. New York: Sharpe.
- Waldron, J. (2009). Exploring a virtual music “community of practice:” Informal music learning on the Internet. *Journal of Music, Technology & Education*, 2, 97-112. doi:10.1386/jmte.2.2-3.97_1
- Wenger, E. & Trayner B. (2015). *Communities of Practice: A Brief Introduction*. Retrieved from <http://wenger-trayner.com/introduction-to-communities-of-practice/>
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge, U.K: Cambridge University Press.
- Wenger, E., McDermott, R. A., & Snyder, W. (2002). *Cultivating Communities of Practice: A Guide to Managing Knowledge*. Boston, Mass: Harvard Business School Press.
- Zhao, X., & Bishop, M. (2011). Understanding and supporting online communities of practice: Lessons learned from Wikipedia. *Educational Technology Research & Development*, 59, 711-735. doi:10.1007/s11423-011-9204-7
- Ziegler, M. F., Paulus, T., & Woodside, M. (2014). Understanding informal group learning in online communities through discourse analysis. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 64(1), 60-78.
- Ziv, A. (1984). *Personality and Sense of Humor*. New York: Springer.

Endnotes

¹ Nonkio identifies herself as a female in a conversation regarding where she got her name.

² Xodzu identifies as male in a video he made for his wife.

³ Phade's real name is Kris McCormic. Conversations on AMV.org reveal the user to be male.

Appendix A: Figures

AMV
ANIMEMUSICVIDEOS.ORG

AMV Are you Plugged in?
ANIMEMUSICVIDEOS.ORG

main menu

- MEMBERS MAIN PAGE
- SEARCH FOR AMVS
- FORUM
- HOW-TO GUIDES
- SITE FAQ
- ABOUT US
- LOGIN

Quick Search For AMVs:

Search

Welcome to **AnimeMusicVideos.org**. This community is dedicated to the creation, discussion, and general enjoyment of fan-made anime music videos.

WEB UPLOADING NOW AVAILABLE!
Now you can upload videos right in your browser! (but FTP uploading is still available for those who want to use it) More details can be found in this forum thread. 2016-01-04 12:33:52 EST

AMV SPOTLIGHT
Here's a video that was highly rated recently...
Log in to the right or sign up to see more!

Anime 404 by BakaOppai

00:00 00:00

JW FLV Media Player is licensed under BY-NC-SA

THIS VIDEO IS PURELY FAN-MADE AND IS NOT ASSOCIATED WITH THE MUSICAL ARTIST OR ANIME COMPANY IN ANY WAY.

THE BIG BOUNCE: NEW SERVER FUND

login to amv

Login ID:
mrjester25

Password:

Remember

Login

Become a member!

Figure 1. Landing page. When a user first comes to the website this is what s/he sees.





members menu

- MY ACCOUNT...
- SEARCH FOR AMVS...
- FANS...
- EDITORS...
- COMMUNITY...
- DONATE...
- GUIDES...
- CONTESTS...
- SITE HELP...
- SITE HELP FORUM
- FAQ
- SITE RULES
- REPORT A BUG
- ABOUT US

SITE HOMEPAGE

MEMBERS MAIN PAGE

USEFUL FILES

LOGOUT

Quick Search For AMVs:

MEMBERS MAIN PAGE

global statistics...

Members	914015
Videos	161922
Creators	53833
Direct DLs	15613
Indirect DLs	7878
Local DLs	98245

'top' lists...

- Top 10% Videos
- Top Star Scale
- Commented Videos
- Top 30 Anime
- Most Used Anime
- Most Used Music
- Most Under Rated

banner ad contest...

Total Banners	21938
Vote Queue	0
New	1
My Worthy	0
My Unworthy	0
Winners	4603

new journal entries...

PENDING STARS... (8)

You have successfully downloaded or streamed the following videos and need to give them star ratings. Please be honest in your star rating. If you have 10 pending ratings, you cannot download any further local videos until the ratings are given. Note: Quick Comments are **anonymous**.

Editor: siny

Title: Creating Something Beautiful

Stars: ☆☆☆☆☆

Quick Comment:

Filename: CreatingSomethingBeautiful-siny-480p.mp4

Date: Oct 29, 2015 Re-Watch Video

Editor: Gene Starwind
21122

Title: Hunters or the Hunted

Stars: ☆☆☆☆☆

Quick Comment:





Filename: [Full Metal Outlaws] Hunters or the Hunted Org Version.avi




Date: Oct 20, 2015 Re-Watch Video




Figure 2. Member main page. This is the screen that greets a user as soon as s/he logs in.

ANNOUNCEMENTS	TOPICS	POSTS	LAST POST
 Site Announcements This forum is for site announcements. Please go here to read the SITE & FORUM RULES.	321	10293	Re: New Feature, Web Uploader by Kariudo  Sun Jan 24, 2016 10:26 am
ANIME MUSIC VIDEOS	TOPICS	POSTS	LAST POST
 AMV Roulette 2016			
 General AMV This forum is for the general discussion of Anime Music Videos. Subforums: D Recommended AMVs , D AMV Suggestions	14612	194680	Re: someone reuploaded my amv... by exkcal  Sat Jan 23, 2016 7:07 pm
 AMV Announcements This forum is to announce newly created/released anime music videos.	21398	182729	Saitama's World by Bote  Tue Jan 26, 2016 12:42 pm
 Opinion Exchange This forum is for people who want to give and receive feedback on videos listed in the catalog, and for getting feedback on beta videos.	5256	72514	Re: Get this FREE STUFF while... by Skarla  Tue Jan 19, 2016 3:47 am
 AMV Contests This forum is for the announcement and discussion of anime music video contests.	2987	86445	Re: ZENKAIKON 2016 AMV Showdo... by Deuce Loosely  Tue Jan 26, 2016 8:18 pm
 Org Supported Contests Subforum: D AMV Roulette 2016	1014	28580	Re: Round 1 by Kagacie  Mon Jan 25, 2016 3:40 am
 Multi-Editor Projects This forum is for the announcement, organisation and discussion of Multi-Editor AMV Projects.	970	85029	Re: The new MEP of the studio... by Ilaghu  Wed Jan 20, 2016 5:48 am
ANIME	TOPICS	POSTS	LAST POST
 General Anime This forum is for the general discussion of Anime. Subforum: D Anime Screenscaps	8968	224442	Re: Winter 2015/2016 anime li... by Joe88  Sat Jan 16, 2016 8:37 pm
 Anime Series Discussion This section is for the rational discussion of anime on a series basis. Spoilers should be expected, but please be courteous to your fellow users.	1050	33373	Re: Dragon Ball Super by exkcal  Fri Jan 22, 2016 9:24 am
 Anime Conventions This forum is for the announcement and discussion of anime conventions, and for the exchanging of rides to, and rooms at, conventions.	1579	21622	Anime Boston - AMV DINNER 2016 by OtakuForLife  Mon Jan 18, 2016 10:45 am
EDITING & TECHNOLOGY	TOPICS	POSTS	LAST POST
 Video & Audio Help This forum is for video and audio help and discussion. Subforums: D Footage Help , D Video Hardware Discussion	8163	62403	Re: Is FPS still important fo... by BadgerKing  Tue Jan 26, 2016 4:51 pm
 Video Editing Software For help and discussion about specific video editing systems like Adobe software, Windows Movie Maker, Magix, Sony Vegas, etc. Please note the subforums. Subforums: D Adobe Software , D Sony Vegas , D Windows Movie Maker , D Mac Software	2683	19153	Re: Any Corel VideoStudio Ult... by summerslover  Tue Jan 19, 2016 9:17 pm

Figure 3. Main forum page. This forum is divided into separate forums for different topics of discussion.

FORUM	TOPICS	POSTS	LAST POST
 Recommended AMVs This forum is for people to list AMVs made by others that they believe to be the best in their field.	74	1867	Re: Action Videos by TheDarkestxDreams  Wed Sep 23, 2015 5:32 pm
 AMV Suggestions This forum is for the sharing of AMV ideas and for help finding clips in anime to use in AMVs.	6006	36390	Creative slump Need amv ideas by suruga  Mon Nov 23, 2015 9:06 pm

New Topic *  
Mark topics read • 8532 topics  1 2 3 4 5 ... 285 >

ANNOUNCEMENTS	REPLIES	VIEWS	LAST POST
 New Feature, Web Uploader by Kariudo » Wed Dec 30, 2015 9:56 pm » in Site Announcements  1 2	27	14298	by Kariudo  Sun Jan 24, 2016 10:26 am
























TOPICS	REPLIES	VIEWS	LAST POST
 So You Want To Be A *GOOD* Anime Music Video Editor? by godix » Wed Feb 18, 2009 11:39 pm  1 ... 9 10 11 12 13	183	102290	by eternalikuto10  Thu Jan 21, 2016 1:49 pm
 So You Want To Be An Anime Music Video Editor? by Kionon » Sat Jul 08, 2006 6:28 pm  1 2 3 4 5	61	134480	by Dragonrider1227  Thu Apr 16, 2015 7:36 pm
 New To A-M-V.org FAQ by Radical_Yue » Wed Dec 05, 2012 3:27 pm  1 2	22	27538	by pizza!  Fri Feb 14, 2014 4:54 am
 The Lip Flapper: Main Thread by CodeZTM » Tue Feb 07, 2012 11:21 am  1 ... 10 11 12 13 14	201	78131	by Rider4Z  Fri Nov 01, 2013 1:35 am
 Review master thread by godix » Sun Nov 14, 2010 4:48 am  1 2	23	33919	by Nya-chan Production  Sun May 01, 2011 3:35 am
 someone reuploaded my amv what do i do? T_T by Flocci » Fri Jan 22, 2016 6:31 am	11	318	by exkcal  Sat Jan 23, 2016 7:07 pm
 Hi a question about one of my uploaded AMV's. by eternalikuto10 » Tue Jan 19, 2016 10:26 pm	0	96	by eternalikuto10  Tue Jan 19, 2016 10:26 pm
 Best Hunter x Hunter (2011) videos by Bote » Mon Jan 18, 2016 8:37 pm	0	87	by Bote  Mon Jan 18, 2016 8:37 pm
 ecchi scene by Salvioman » Mon Jan 18, 2016 4:07 pm	0	61	by Salvioman  Mon Jan 18, 2016 4:07 pm

Figure 4. Deeper into the forum. When a user clicks on one of the discussion subjects this is what s/he will see.

Re: Hi! Question about the forum?
by [redacted]

Mo'l wrote:
not really, but that doesnt seem like bad idea.its cool to have a backup right? You need a separate entry for each vid. 🐉

...stupid me... I found the anime I was looking for...

Joined: Wed Apr 20, 2016 7:04 pm
Contact: [redacted]

Re: Hi! Question about the forum?
[redacted]

You wont be punished. Yeah It takes getting use to this old webpage 🙄

Still better than that MMO.

plot hole

Strawberry Pie
Joined: Thu Feb 22, 2007 2:28 am
Status: Star Huntin'
Location: Sweden
Contact: [redacted]

Re: Hi! Question about the forum?
[redacted]


Mo'l, your answer is correct, but it's better if a moderator explains, since I was the one who approved the topic and addressed the question. That said, I appreciate your friendliness. We want the newbies (to the site, if not to editing), to stick around. 😊

ShadowCore, you will not be "punished" per se, It's a very common mistake, but your posts for AMVs not entered into the catalog will be deleted. You don't need to use the old upload system (and we're working on that).


Of course, "quite tedious" is a matter of perspective, when I started editing, we didn't even have broadband. Quality was low, file sizes large, and rendering times several hours if not days. You don't know how good you have it. 😊

I ♥ the 80's
Joined: Fri Mar 02, 2001 10:13 pm
Status: 日本人になる人の海川です。
Location: 日本, 東京
Contact: [redacted]


Figure 5. Even deeper into the forum. This is a snippet of a conversation between three members.



ANIMEMUSICVIDEOS.ORG



AnimeMusicVideos.org
Messses with your head!



members menu

- MY ACCOUNT...
- SEARCH FOR AMVS...
- SUPER SEARCH
- NEWEST VIDEOS
- NEWEST DOWNLOADS
- SEARCH BY ANIME
- SEARCH BY MUSICIAN
- ALL SEARCH OPTIONS

- FANS...
- EDITORS...
- COMMUNITY...
- CHAT ROOMS
- FORUM
- MY JOURNAL BUDDIES
- SEARCH FOR MEMBERS
- SITE STORE

- DONATE...
- GUIDES...
- CONTESTS...
- SITE HELP...

- SITE HOMEPAGE
- MEMBERS MAIN PAGE
- USEFUL FILES
- LOGOUT

Quick Search For AMVs:

MY PROFILE

(Add user to My Alerts)

User Name: AuraSilversky
Member Since: Sunday, June 15, 2003, 9:09 AM
Name: Erin Yates
Location: Michigan City, IN, United States
Homepage: <http://www.geocities.com/aurasilversky/>
Last Login: 2015-02-02 11:15:47
Forum Info: Profile Posts (5)
Journal: Last entry made on 2010-08-27 07:48:50
Usefulness: 99.8 with 32 opinions
 [average 119.7 of 231221 opinions; standard deviation 432.6]

Profile:
 Love Anime, Role-Playing Games, and most things dealing with fantasy or sci-fi of any sort. Have a youtube channel under myramistweave.

global average

Count	231221
Originality	8.47
Visual Quality	8.37
Audio	9.00
Action Sync	8.45
Lip Sync	8.24
Special Effects	8.49
Effort	8.60
Re-view-ability	7.92
Overall	8.43



average given

Count	32
Originality	8.91
Visual Quality	8.28
Audio	9.50
Action Sync	8.41
Lip Sync	8.71
Special Effects	9.33
Effort	8.69
Re-view-ability	7.84
Overall	8.44

average received

Count	128
Originality	8.91
Visual Quality	8.44
Audio	9.30
Action Sync	8.51
Lip Sync	8.20
Special Effects	8.75
Effort	8.66
Re-view-ability	8.18
Overall	8.63

Figure 6. Member Profile page. These pages list information about users.

members menu

- MY ACCOUNT...
- VIEW PROFILE
- EDIT PROFILE
- LOCAL DOWNLOADS
- DOWNLOAD QUEUE
- MY JOURNAL
- SUBMITTED BANNERS

- SEARCH FOR AMVS...
- SUPER SEARCH
- NEWEST VIDEOS
- NEWEST DOWNLOADS
- SEARCH BY ANIME
- SEARCH BY MUSICIAN
- ALL SEARCH OPTIONS

- FANS...
- EDITORS...
- COMMUNITY...
- CHAT ROOMS
- FORUM
- MY JOURNAL BUDDIES
- SEARCH FOR MEMBERS
- SITE STORE

- DONATE...
- GUIDES...
- CONTESTS...
- SITE HELP...
- SITE HELP FORUM

VIDEO INFORMATION

Information

Member: Gene Starwind 21122

Studio: Full Metal Outlaws

Title: Hunters or the Hunted

Premiered: 2007-02-19

Categories:

Action	Drama
Serious	

Song:
Crimson Orchid
Decisions (Lyrics By Bryan Carmella)

Anime:

Bleach	<i>Escaflowne - The Movie (Movie)</i>
Naruto	<i>Rurouni Kenshin / Samurai X - 1st OVA (Tsuiokuhen, Trust & Betrayal)</i>
	<i>Wolf's Rain</i>
<i>Rurouni Kenshin / Samurai X - 2nd OVA (Seisouhen, Reflection)</i>	



Participation:

<i>Genericon XX, Genericon XX AMV Contest (2007-01-28)</i>	AMV RAW Ultimate Vengeance, Ultimate Vengeance (2007-02-22)
--	---

Comments:
WARNING SPOILERS

This video was a great experience. It let me use a song that I wrote the lyrics to. The original idea was for me to create a song that I could listen to. Then as I developed the song the idea for an amv came to me. So this video is about "Decisions" we make in our lives. The song has several messages in it. As for creating this video. It turned out to be more difficult than I thought. The reason is that I had to be careful of not killing off any of the characters before when I suppose to. The reason I made these anime selections is because I feel that they contributed to the feel of the song. The main idea behind the song is that are you going to fight or are you going to back down. If you do fight do you know what the limit is? Are you fighting for the right reason? Then the song makes comments on traits for when we do fight "we are no better than the animals facing their rivals." Then the last thing is the whole "is an image that can't be held." This line here refers to your life falling apart when it seems like everything was going right. So the more you look at the song the more things you can extract from it.

Figure 7. Video information page. Displays information about anime music videos.

members menu

- MY ACCOUNT...
- SEARCH FOR AMVS...
- SUPER SEARCH
- NEWEST VIDEOS
- NEWEST DOWNLOADS
- SEARCH BY ANIME
- SEARCH BY MUSICIAN
- ALL SEARCH OPTIONS

- FANS...
- EDITORS...
- COMMUNITY...
- CHAT ROOMS
- FORUM
- MY JOURNAL BUDDIES
- SEARCH FOR MEMBERS
- SITE STORE

- DONATE...
- GUIDES...
- CONTESTS...
- SITE HELP...

- SITE HOMEPAGE
- MEMBERS MAIN PAGE
- USEFUL FILES
- LOGOUT

OPINION INFORMATION

Mamma Mia - Ghost Hunt -- AuraSilversky (Erin Yates)

Member	The Narrator								
Rankings	Orig.	Capture	Sound	Action	Lip	Effects	Effort	Re-view	Overall
	9	7	8	8	8	7	8	8	9
Good	This is a song I can see Mai singing to Naru - it fits her personality so well! I also liked the "bouncy" pace of the clips. Loved that you didn't have subtitles.								
Bad	... wish the quality of the clips could be a little better, but meh, that's WMM for ya. (>.<)								
General	Overall, a thoroughly enjoyable vid for a series that gets far too little attention. Please continue making Ghost Hunt AMVs!								

Opinions given by...

The Narrator

Figure 8. Opinion information page. This is where users can post opinions and read opinions posted by others.

Appendix B: Coding Scheme

- 1) Mutual Engagement (Green).
 - a) **Answering/asking questions**- Questions posed by a member of the group, users helping researching the answer, sharing expertise, challenging each other, seeking feedback, and accepting critiques.
 - b) **Sharing personal stories** - A member might give background information to set up question so potential respondents will be able to understand the situation better. A member who answers the question may tell a story to show they handled a similar problem.
 - c) **Challenging One Another** – “Seeking feedback and accepting critiques where doing so could broaden...learning” (Evans et al., 2014, p. 219).
- 2) Joint enterprise (Purple).
 - a) **Negotiation** - Users constantly reevaluate and discuss the goals of the website and the practice.
 - b) **Accountability/Encouragement** - This involves members answering new posts, and keeping the conversations flowing without relying on moderators to do so. This can establish a culture where members are encouraged, not discouraged.
- 3) Shared Repertoire (Blue).
 - a) **Tools** – Resources that a users share with each other |
 - b) **Older posts** - This repertoire includes the evidence of previous acts of mutual engagement in the form of archived questions and answers
 - c) **Jargon** - Jargon in the form of specific terms where the meaning is understood without it being explicitly stated.
 - d) **Shared links** - Shared links to external websites and resources, as well as an understanding of seminal works and people of the practice
 - e) **Running jokes**- In order to understand them, a member would need to have followed the discussion to a certain extent.

Coding Scheme 1. Used to code for mutual engagement, joint enterprise, and shared repertoire on AMV.org.

4) Social Status (Yellow).

a) Legitimate Peripheral Participation (LPP)

- i) **Peripherality** - Refers to newcomers being given a chance by the more experienced users to be involved with the practice of the community. It occurs when a participant engages in the practice, learns how to do the practice, and begins to understand how the community works.
 - ii) **Legitimacy** - Can happen when someone contributes something useful to the community, is already known to someone in the community, or puts themselves out there in a likable and approachable fashion. They create their own specialties and styles. They gain a reputation. They achieve status and generate their own personal sphere of influence.
- b) **Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD)** - Learners have a certain number of potential learning routes available to them, and that higher levels of thinking could be fostered through "social interactions with [more] knowledgeable members of the society" (Gredler, 2009, p. 337).

5) Norms

- a) **Implicit Norms** – Implicit norms are unwritten expectations regarding appropriate behavior [sic] in the online community; they emerge through interactions among its members. E.g. being self taught, not stating that they are an expert, reciprocity.
- b) **Explicit Norms** - Explicit norms provide formalized expectations regarding group member behaviours [sic] and social interactions.
- c) **Institutional Power** – “If an individual is to have the right (power) to sanction another’s access and admission, then that right (power) must be recognized and accepted by the majority of the community, and thus they must be considered to be towards the apex of the hierarchy” (p.576).
- d) **Story Telling Power** - Having good story skills allowed individuals to position themselves in relation to others and gave them the ability to shape the ideas and directions of the CoP since they had a stronger voice.
- e) **Structural Power** -Members can have social status symbols quite literally attached to their avatar.

Coding Scheme 2. Used to code social status on AMV.org.

Appendix C: IRB Approval



UNIVERSITY OF
ARKANSAS

Office of Research Compliance
Institutional Review Board

January 29, 2016

MEMORANDUM

TO: Christopher Mikkelson
Ron Warren

FROM: Ro Windwalker
IRB Coordinator

RE: New Protocol Approval

IRB Protocol #: 16-01-465

Protocol Title: *Remixing, Learning and Social Status in Online Communities of Practice*

Review Type: EXEMPT EXPEDITED FULL IRB

Approved Project Period: Start Date: 01/28/2016, Expiration Date: 01/27/2017

Your protocol has been approved by the IRB. Protocols are approved for a maximum period of one year. If you wish to continue the project past the approved project period (see above), you must submit a request, using the form *Continuing Review for IRB Approved Projects*, prior to the expiration date. This form is available from the IRB Coordinator or on the Research Compliance website (<https://vpred.uark.edu/units/rscp/index.php>). As a courtesy, you will be sent a reminder two months in advance of that date. However, failure to receive a reminder does not negate your obligation to make the request in sufficient time for review and approval. Federal regulations prohibit retroactive approval of continuation. Failure to receive approval to continue the project prior to the expiration date will result in Termination of the protocol approval. The IRB Coordinator can give you guidance on submission times.

If you wish to make any modifications in the approved protocol, you must seek approval *prior to* implementing those changes. All modifications should be requested in writing (email is acceptable) and must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.

If you have questions or need any assistance from the IRB, please contact me at 109 MLKG Building, 5-2208, or irb@uark.edu.