Discursive Equality and Everyday Talk Online: the impact of "super-participants"

Abstract

Empirical studies of online debate almost universally observe a "dominant" minority of posters. Informed by theories of deliberative democracy, these are typically framed negatively – yet research into their impact on debate is scant. To address this, a typology of what we call super-participation (super-posters, agenda-setters and facilitators) is developed and applied to the http://www.moneysavingexpert.com/ forum. Focusing on the first of these, we found 2052 super-posters (0.4%) contributing 47% of 25m+ posts. While super-posters were quantitatively dominant, qualitative content analysis of the discursive behaviour of 25 super-posters (n=40,044) found that most did not attempt to stop other users from posting (curbing) or attack them (flaming). In fact, in contradiction to the received wisdom, super-posters discursively performed a range of positive roles.

Keywords: political talk, public sphere, deliberation, virtual community

Discursive Equality and Everyday Talk Online: the impact of "super-participants"

Introduction

Debate about the equality (or not) of online talk persists. Empirical studies of, for example, online political talk typically observe a highly active, "dominant" minority of posters. Davis (2005, pp. 58-59) found that there were dominant minorities in Usenet forums, though he does not analyse what impact this had on the nature of the debate (see also Kuperman, 2006). Focusing on the Jihadist forum, Awan (2007) found that 87% of registered members had never posted; 13% had posted at least once; 5% had made more than 50 posts and 1% had made more than 500 posts. Awan (2007, p. 394) states that: "A small but vocal, active core posts new content, initiates debates and responds to questions posed by newcomers." However, it is not clear on what empirical basis these observations were made. Author A (2006) identified an active minority in the UK government's Downing Street online discussion forum but also did not explore their impact (see also Dunne, 2009; Jankowski & Van Os, 2004; Winkler, 2005). In a subsequent article focusing on the EU's Futurum forum, Author A (2007) again identified a dominant minority but went further by looking at how they set the agenda. He found evidence that they did set agendas by posting on the same topics repeatedly and even posting identical seed posts. Moving away from online discussion forums, Anstead and O'Loughlin (2011) identified a small minority of active participants on Twitter debates surrounding a political discussion show on television, but they also did not explore this finding further. Shifting to the blogosphere, studies have identified significant disparities in the link structure and volume of postings (Davis, 2009, p. 58; Hindman, 2009), but analysis of the discursive behaviour of this blogging elite remains scant.

When studies have looked in more depth at the behaviour of highly active participants, a positive function has been suggested. Albrecht's (2006, p. 70) analysis of the Demos debate

in the city of Hamburg found that 20% of participants created 75% of the posts. However, they acted as "old hands", largely replying to others. Similarly, Kies' (2010) study of the large (over 500,000 message) Radicali political party discussion forum in Italy also suggests a more positive role. The 10 most frequent posters created over 25% of all the posts (averaging over 5000 messages each). However, he concludes that the forum was an "exemplary" case and that although "the debates are dominated by a minority of users […] this apparent domination should not overshadow the participative and deliberative importance of the forum…" (2010, pp. 141-142). The existence of a highly active minority would appear, thus, to be the norm and is an extension of the 1/9/90 rule, which predicts that only 1% of users of a forum actually post, with 90% lurking and 9% editing.[1] However, the empirical research lacks depth, and there are differences of opinion with regard to their actual impact on debate.

Much of the literature that has analysed such communication has been framed by theories of deliberative democracy and the public sphere. The work of Habermas, and particularly his ideal speech situation and discourse ethics, are particularly influential. Habermas effectively argues that anyone who has the competence to speak should be allowed to take part in the discourse if they wish to do so (Chambers 1996, p. 187). Put simply, communication must be egalitarian in nature. Building on this, Dahlberg (2001a, 2001b) has emphasised the importance of discursive equality and inclusion to the online public sphere. There are, however, differences of opinion (or different readings of Habermas's thinking) about the extent to which communication in the public sphere must be based on equality and egalitarianism – and what these concepts mean in practice.

The more widely held view is that there must be *equality of access* to (i.e. the chance to participate in) the public sphere and that each individual's view must be treated with respect. Following this logic, the volumes of participation of specific individuals are not problematic so long as they do not attempt to stop others from participating. In fact, the

regularly ephemeral and disjointed nature of online debate is often said to make the presence

of an active minority a distinct positive (Smith, 2009). As Dahlberg (2001a) puts it: "given

the lack of bodily signifiers, an online discussion's cohesion and very existence needs regular

posters who can always be relied upon to have an opinion and so keep conversation going."

Similarly, Oldenburg (1999) argues that "the regulars" are crucial to the construction of what

he calls third places: communal venues beyond home or work (such as pubs and cafes) where

informal political talk emerges. However, it must be questioned: is there a point at which an

active minority effectively puts off potential, lurking or infrequent participants from engaging

in debate - even though they are not discursively attempting to block them by what they say?

If this is the case, quantitative analysis of participation rates would appear to be important.

Indeed, it seems counterintuitive to completely ignore the volume of an individual's postings

if we want to assess their impact on discursive equality because this is likely linked to the

construction of authority. This leads us to the second position.

The more literal approach argues that there must be discursive equality – *equality of*

participation. For example, Cohen (1997, p. 69 – see also Knight and Johnson, 1997) argues

that there must be "some form of *manifest equality* among citizen". Dahlberg (2001a) focuses

more specifically on the everyday public sphere: "More difficult to deal with, and thus more

problematic for achieving egalitarian and inclusive discourse, is the qualitative domination of

conversations by particular individuals and groups. Here, dominant participants may not

necessarily be directly abusive or say more; rather, they assert their influence and sideline

other participant's views by dictating the agenda and style of dialogue." Recourse is again

made to the perceived nature of online communication, but this time to justify the use of

moderators and posting limits to facilitate equality (Author A & , 2007). For Coleman and

Gotze (2001, pp. 17-18): "mechanisms of moderation and mediation are crucial to the success

of many-to-many, asynchronous dialogue". The famous Minnesota E-democracy forums were

more direct, limiting each participant to two posts per day in an attempt to stop quantitative domination by a minority (Dahlberg, 2001b).

There are clearly differences of opinion and uncertainties within the literature – and practice – compounded by a distinct lack of empirical research. This is unsurprising because there is a lack of agreement – and often a lack of specificity to theoretical models – as to what constitutes an active (or dominant) minority, and this makes it difficult to observe and interpret such behaviour in practice. To help move these debates forward and guide future research, we develop a three-part typology of what we call super-participation: super-posters, agenda-setters and facilitators.[2] Due to space limitations, we focus our empirical analysis on super-posters, applying it to the www.moneysavingexpert.com forum. We argue that to fully understand the relative equality of Internet debate, and how the active minority impacts this, researchers must analyse posting patterns *and* discursive behaviour. To this end, we combine an over-arching quantitative content analysis with a detailed qualitative content analysis.

A Typology of Super-participation

In the literature on user behaviour within online forums, there are myriad attempts to develop typologies (Golder, 2003; Turner & Fischer, 2006) and study particular categories of behaviour/participation. These include trolls (Donath, 1996), experts (Welser et al., 2007), information seekers, opinion leaders, busy bodies, question posters and those that participate in debates (Viegas & Smith, 2004). It is striking that even the most detailed typologies (Golder, 2003) give little (if any) weight to the volume of participation. Kim (2000, p. 118) and Sonnenbichler's (2010) related Membership Life Cycle models do begin to move us in this direction. As the name suggests, these models are based on the length of membership and how comfortable people feel when participating. Kim's more linear approach covers visitors, novices, regulars, leaders and elders, while Sonnenbichler's more fluid model has categories

for visitors, novices, actives, passives, leaders and trolls. While these models are helpful, they do not include any actual detail on posting volumes for each category and the regular/active pool is too broad. More nuance is needed when considering active participants, and to this end, we put forward the concept of "super-participants".

At the most basic level, to describe something as "super" implies going above and beyond the norm. In terms of participation in a discussion forum, there are two principal forms of posting activity: users can start new threads or post within existing ones. Bringing this together, we identify two types of super-participant: Super-posters and Agenda-setters. The third category, facilitators, refers to the people who manage the day-to-day activities on the forum. The three categories are not mutually exclusive.

SP1: Super-posters

Super-posters (SP1s) are those participants who post very frequently in a discussion forum. There are a number of different ways to approach and define what counts as a super-poster. The issue is made more complicated because we can assume that the volume of individual user postings is linked to the age and size of a forum: the bigger and older the forum is, the greater the number of SP1s. If this assumption is correct, it suggests that we should calculate SP1s by determining either a small percentage, or a set number, of the most frequent posters. There are, however, some concerns with this approach. First, the level of individual user postings can vary significantly, and this would be reflected in any sample. There is a danger that the most frequent participants on some forums would actually have made only a limited number of posts. To consider a participant as super, we argue that they must have created a minimum number of threads or made more than a certain number of posts. Thus, to resolve this issue, a minimum number of posts must be adopted – but this leads to our second concern – which is with larger forums.

Discussion forums vary in scale from a few hundred posts, to nearly two billion: there are hundreds of forums with over 10,000,000 posts.[3] On large discussion forums with millions of posts, it is highly unlikely that one person will have created even 1% of all posts, and adapting this approach would, thus, be complicated. It would also mean that users who may have made tens of thousands of posts would be excluded – and this gets to the heart of our concern, which is not (necessarily) to analyse the dominant minority, but to analyse all users who participate regularly.

To account for variations in forum size, we argue that a super-poster should be defined as any user that has created more than 2% of all messages on a forum with between 20,000 and 99,9999 posts and any user who has made more than 2000 posts on a forum with over 100,000 thousand messages. This gives a minimum post count of 400 on a forum with 20,000 posts. We set the level at 2000 posts because any user making this many posts must have spent a significant amount of time and effort writing posts. This approach is informed by our inclusive rather than exclusive approach; we want to find all participants that qualify as super-participants rather than an elite minority: in theory every user on a forum could qualify as a super-participant. But how does this marry with the notion that "super" implies going beyond the norm? First, it is highly unlikely to actually happen. Second, existing analyses of online discussion forums suggest that in most cases, participation at this level is atypical, and this reflects our broader approach to consider the bigger picture rather than a specific forum. The second type of Super-participant (SP2) attempts to set the agenda of forums.

SP2: Agenda-setters

The presence of people who attempt to set the agenda of online forums has, again, been widely noted, but with relatively limited attempt to focus on their impact in depth. According to Bua (2012), the importance of agenda setting is often not fully appreciated in the literature

on political communication and participation – with limited theoretical and empirical work to date. In the context of Usenet discussion forums, Himelboim et al. (2009) have undertaken a detailed study of new thread creation. They found that many Usenet forums featured a small group of 'discussion catalysts' whose seed posts inspired a lot of debate. Interestingly, these users largely posted stories from elsewhere on the web with little or no comment – a relatively conservative approach to setting the agenda. Himelboim et al. do not make clear whether the 'catalysts' focused on specific issues. Moreover, they did not analyse how, if at all, these users engaged in the subsequent debate.

We have categorised agenda-setters as super-participants because they can have a disproportionate influence on the nature of debate and argumentation that occurs. The inclusion of agenda-setting reflects our view that influence is not limited to the volume of posts alone. Agenda-setters may post on similar topics, or within specific sections of forums. Based on both our previous experience of analyzing thread creation, and on findings in broader studies, we have set the bar for SP2s at 200 threads. We argue that any user creating 200 threads will have a significant impact on the forum and that thread creation at this level indicates a high degree of participatory commitment.

SP3: Facilitators

Facilitators perform a specific, formal function within discussion forums because they help to set the tone and can normally moderate, manage or otherwise advise broader participants. The precise role of facilitators is determined by the forum – as is the selection process for who becomes a facilitator. Author A (2006) has previously outlined a series of potential roles, distinguishing between moderators and facilitators. This can involve the management of SP1s and SP2s.[4] Indeed, the activity of SP3s can directly impact their behaviour. The importance of facilitators to political talk is widely recognised (Edwards, 2002; Coleman & Blumler, 2009;

Davies & Penagathen, 2009). Having outlined the concept of super-participation, we now

present the methodological approach and case study adopted.

Methodology

Due to space limitations the analysis of super-participation focuses on the first of these – SP1s

– using both quantitative and qualitative measures. Our typology makes no judgment on

whether the impact of SPs on the nature of debate is positive or negative. This must be

determined through empirical analysis. Thus, in order to analyse how SP1s communicate, we

have undertaken both a broad quantitative content analysis and a detailed qualitative content

analysis. Our selection of the case and coding frame is informed by our earlier work that has

argued there is a need for more analysis of informal political talk in non-political online

forums – third spaces – using inclusive definitions of both politics and what counts as

deliberation (Author B, 2008, 2010, 2012; Author A, 2012a, b). Thus, we propose to analyse

the www.moneysavingexpert.com (MSE) discussion forum.

The MSE forum is part of a larger website and email list operated by the finance guru,

Martin Lewis.[5] The forum has 54 different topic areas, most devoted to different areas of a

person's financial life (e.g. credit cards, mortgages) but with broader chat areas (e.g. Money

Saver Arms). The forum has 25,195,926 million posts from 942,588 registered users in

1,788,165 threads within 54 topic areas.[6] It is one of the largest forums in the UK and was of

interest to us because anecdotal evidence suggests that users make major financial decisions

on the basis of advice from strangers and that political talk often emerges.[7] An underlying

research question was, thus, to determine whether the MSE forum did actually constitute a

third space.

The qualitative content analysis focused on 25 randomly selected Super-posters. To

identify the sample, a list of all participants by frequency of postings was hand-scraped from

the MSE forum alongside their basic user data. We then identified all SP1s (n=2052) before identifying a random sample of 25 from the list in order to investigate their posting behaviour in more detail. Beginning with the most frequent poster, every 80th SP (this was selected based on the total number of SP1s) active during 2008-2012 was selected for analysis. Each profile included apparent links to all of the posts and threads created (and participated in) by the user and the number of times they had thanked another user, or one of their posts had been thanked. On inspection, we found that these were capped at the most recent 300 messages (or the most recent 300 threads participated in). Consequently, we had to work within this limitation; it was not possible to analyse all of the posts made by each of the 25 SP1s. The thread and post creation were scraped off, including what forums they were posting in.

Once the quantitative analysis of SP1s was complete, a qualitative content analysis (Mayring, 2000) of the 25 SP1s' posting behaviour was conducted. The unit of analysis was the individual posting. The context unit of analysis was the discussion thread. Thus, in order to maintain the social integrity of the discussions, the unit of selection was the discussion thread, as opposed to the individual posting. In other words, one needs to read posts in the context of the whole thread in order to say something about discursive behaviour.

The selection of threads was based on three criteria. First, only threads that were active during 2008-2012 were selected. Second, we decided to take different sized threads as behaviour might vary between small and large threads. Three sizes were distinguished: small threads (<100 postings), medium threads (≥100 and <300 postings) and large threads (≥300 and ≤ 600 postings). The cap was set at 600 as our initial investigation of the forum revealed that most threads did not exceed 600 posts. Those threads that did were typically large consisting of thousands of posts set over several years. Finally, since we were analysing posting behaviour, at least 50 postings per SP1 were gathered.

Given that the unit of selection was the thread and not the posting, several rounds of sampling were carried out in order to gather 50 postings for each of the 25 SP1s. This was necessary as some SP1s posted only a few messages over numerous threads. In the first round, two small, two medium and two large threads for each SP1 were randomly selected. For those SP1s where 50 postings were not collected, a second round of sampling was conducted by randomly selecting another set of small, medium and large threads. Any SP1 where 50 or more postings were still not obtained, we then proceed to randomly select small, medium and large threads until this was achieved in a final round of sampling (see Table 1 for posting totals).

[Insert Table 1 about here]

All threads were archived during August, December and February 2011-2012 and transferred to MAXQDA (a qualitative content analysis software programme) for hand coding. Mayring's procedures for carrying out inductive coding via the use of feedback loops were used for the analysis. Author B's (2008) coding scheme, which was developed to analyse political talk in non-political forums, was initially adopted for the analysis. During several rounds of coding and recoding, categories were modified, merged and deleted, while new ones were created until a final set of coding categories was deduced.

A posting can potentially serve multiple functions; a participant can address multiple participants and/or issues. For example, in a single post, a participant can give advice on applying for disability benefits to one person, while later in the post, debate the recent proposed changes to the NHS. Thus, the ten categories introduced below are not mutually exclusive. In order to increase confidence in the findings and in the reliability of the final coding scheme, an inter-coder reliability test was conducted. Once the analysis was complete

and the final coding scheme was deduced, two additional coders were trained. A random sample of threads, amounting to 10 per cent of posts, were counter-coded. The final coding scheme was relatively reliable, with 8 of the 10 categories scoring greater than 94% for the average pairwise percent agreement, while scoring .68 or higher for Krippendorff's Alpha.[8]

Super-Participation on the MSE Forum: Quantitative Analysis

The quantitative analysis was designed to give us a broad overview of the behaviour of Super-participants. Before beginning, it should be noted that the list of users on which the data is based featured just over 500,000 users, significantly less than the near one million users stated on the board statistics page – we use only the visible (list) data here. In total, we identified 2052 SP1s, who had made 11.8m posts averaging 5745 posts each. However, using averages is somewhat distorting because this covers users that have been members for 106 days to 3882 days; made between 2001 posts and 116,074 posts; and averaged 1 post per day to over 100 posts per day. Tables 2-4 below present the core data for all SP1s.

[Insert Tables 2-4 about here]

The first striking finding is the number of users that have created many thousands of posts. Put simply: there are many SP1s on the MSE forum. While they account for only 0.4% of the listed users, they made 47% of all posts. It can be said, thus, that the SP1s on this forum are quantitatively dominant and that the MSE forum broadly follows the pattern identified in previous websites. However, it must be noted that nearly 200,000 users only posted once. This is, perhaps, unsurprising as MSE is used by many as an advice forum – and we might expect such users to ask questions with a smaller number of "experts" that reply (Welser et al., 2007). Furthermore, SP1s were much more likely to have participated in the preceding

months than the whole (around 28% had posted since the turn of 2011 and 75% of our sample – see below – had participated in the previous 24 hours of the analysis date). Put simply, the data suggests that many SP1s were heavily committed to the forum; they spend a significant portion of time each week participating; they continue to do so for a significant length of time; and they accumulate vast numbers of posts. Having analysed the overarching data for all SP1s, we now turn our attention to the 25 SP1s for which we conducted a detailed analysis.

The number of thanks received by a user is a strong indicator of how other users perceive the style and content of their posts. In our sample, 5 users were thanked at least once in more than 90% of all their posts, but 6 users were thanked in less than half of their posts (see Tables 5 and 6). There were similar variations in the average number of thanks per post: 3 users received less than 1 thanks for each post made, but 7 users received more than 5 thanks per post (with the highest being 11). There were, thus, significant variations in how SP1s' posts were perceived by other users; some rarely received feedback but others were thanked repeatedly.

Thanking other users for their posts is also an important communal act. It was not possible to conduct a complete analysis of the extent to which the SP1s thanked other users; this was capped by the website at the most recent 300 thanked messages. While 79% of the SP1s had posted more than 300 thanks, 5 had not with one user only thanking 7 other users. SP1s also gave some personal information including date of birth or age (9), location (14), interests (5), a biography (5) and occupation (6).[9]

[Insert Tables 5 & 6 about here]

While it is not possible to conduct a detailed analysis of SP2 behaviour in this article, we can give some initial findings from our sample, and more generally outline their thread

creation behaviour. First, it should be noted that our SP1s created new threads (seeds) far less frequently: only two SP1s had created more than 200 seed messages and thus also qualified as SP2s, while only one other user had created more than 100 seeds. There were also significant differences in the number of replies that SP1s received. While we must exclude one user who made at least 300 new threads because we do not know the total number, we found 10 users averaged less than 10 replies while a further 6 averaged more than 100 replies for each seed message (up to 1124 messages). Users who made less seed posts tended to receive more replies when they did make one. There were similar disparities with thread views, with the lowest averaging 324 views but the highest averaging 39,496 views. The data provide prima facie evidence that there were significant differences and that some users were more successful at steering debates than others. However, further qualitative content analysis is necessary to explore this issue.

Super-Participation on the MSE Forum: Qualitative Content Analysis

There were 239 threads from 41 different sub-forums, which consisted of 40,044 postings, included in the analysis. The first striking finding is that SP1s (all SP1s) were responsible for 49% of the postings; quantitatively speaking, they clearly dominated these discussions and the sample appears to follow a similar pattern to the whole forum (where SP1s created 47% of posts). However, what kind of role did SP1s play in these threads? Did they dominate the discussions in a negative way (e.g. putting off infrequent posters), or did they behave more like Oldenburg's regulars and facilitate and enhance conversation, political talk and community building in general? We now turn our attention to their discursive behaviour.

The 25 SP1s under investigation contributed 1,699 postings to the 239 threads, accounting for 4% of the total postings. When taking a closer look at their postings, several clear patterns emerged. First, a common criticism of online discussion forums has been that

they tend to foster shouting matches as opposed reciprocal exchange among participants. However, this was not the case for our sample. In particular, 81% of SP1s postings were coded as replies.[10] In other words, they were frequently reading and responding to fellow participants' posts. Second, as Figure 1 shows, 4 clusters consisting of 10 posting behaviours were identified by the analysis. These were a) storytelling/providing personal information, banter/humour; b) advice giving/helping, requesting advice/help, acknowledgements; c) arguing/debating, interpreting/clarifying, providing factual information; d) degrading and curbing.

[Insert Figure 1 about here]

The first cluster of behaviours identified by the analysis was closely linked to social bonding. The most common behaviour was storytelling/providing personal information, which accounted for 36% of the total messages posted by the 25 SP1s. For 16 of these participants, it represented a quarter or more of their postings. SP1s frequently shared their stories (e.g. personal experiences), account of events (e.g. status updates on what they did that day) or other personal information (e.g. likes/dislikes, interests, information about their family/friends/relationships). Storytelling and the providing personal information seemed to serve two purposes. First, such behaviour tended to foster everyday conversation among forum participants. SP1s were not only sharing their own experiences and information, but were often eliciting and encouraging others to share their stories. As a result, participants got to know each other; they bonded and developed friendly relationships. Outside everyday conversation, SP1s also used storytelling and personal information as a means of fuelling and informing (and sometimes sparking) debate and discussion on particular issues; as Dahlberg (2001a) argues, they kept the debate going.

The use of humour/banter was another behaviour that seemed to foster a friendly communicative environment. It accounted for 11% of the postings. On occasions, SP1s engaged in good-natured teasing and the exchange of witty remarks with fellow participants. Such behaviour seemed to act as a form of social bonding, strengthening the relationships between participants. On further inspection, we discovered that banter was mostly done 'in house': SP1s engaged in banter with each other as opposed to with non-SP1s. However, this is not surprising as SP1s are highly active and develop relationships with each other, allowing playful and flirtatious communicative practices to emerge thereby strengthening those relationships further. That said, the use of banter/humour, as Basu (1999: 390-394) has argued, seemed to act as 'social glue': it fostered a warm atmosphere, allowing a more productive communicative environment to emerge.

A third cluster of behaviours identified by the analysis focused on consultative and supportive discourse. Advice giving/helping was the second most common behaviour, representing 19% of the postings. During the course of many of the discussions that took place, SP1s took on the role of a consultant by providing 'expert' advice to fellow forum participants (typically to non-SPs) on everything from consumer rights to loan lending procedures, which is in line with Albrecht's (2006) findings. Many SP1s claimed to be 'experts' such as accountants, financial advisors and lawyers. However, it was not always about providing 'expert' advice. These SP1s also drew from their life lessons and experiences as a means of offering 'friendly' advice and recommendations. For example, they offered advice on everything from how to cut back on family expenditures to how to communicate better with one's spouse/partner. SP1s were also often helpful. For example, when forum participants asked for directions, recipes or contact information, SP1s were typically the ones there to help. Requesting advice/help among SP1s, on the other hand, was not as common, representing 5% of postings: SP1s largely gave rather than sought advice.

The use of acknowledgements was another behaviour identified by the analysis, which was supportive in nature. It accounted for 14% of the postings. This included postings where a participant acknowledged the presence, departure or action/situation of another forum participant. The four most common acknowledgments used by SP1s were words of encouragement, statements of sympathy and understanding, complimenting and thanking. In many cases, SP1s provided emotional support to fellow forum participants who were, for example, having difficulties with claiming benefits, going through a divorce or debt crisis, as the posting below illustrates:

> Good to see you posting again this morning hon - and I am glad you and you OH are now singing from the same hymn sheet.
>
> Do not despair - you are already on your way out the debt situation because you have now taken steps to arrest the debt spiral. Rest assured it can be done, with grace and elegance. One month ago I became debt free - paid of 10k of debt in two years and one of those years was spent on benefits and the other as a single mum on minimum income, so take heart.

Overall, such behaviour seemed to have strengthened bonds between forum participants.

Another cluster of behaviours identified by the analysis was closely linked to political talk. As discussed above, one of the aims of this article was to investigate the extent to which the MSE Forum functioned as a third place (Oldenburg, 1999), or as Author A (2012, forthcoming) has argued, a third space – an environment that fosters informal political talk. Thus, in addition to the analysis discussed above, all 239 threads were coded for political discussions. Author B's (2008) criteria for identifying (and assessing) political talk in non-political online forums, which captures both conventional and lifestyle-based political issues that arise during the course of everyday conversation, were adopted. All threads that contained a posting in which (a) a participant made a connection from a particular experience,

interest or issue to society and which (b) stimulated reflection and a response by at least one other participant were coded as political threads.

After applying the criteria, 77 threads, which consisted of 39% of the postings, were coded as political threads. Political talk here dealt with everything from health care reform to the underlying causes behind the 2011 London riots. The topics also ranged from more conventional political issues such as government policies on social housing to more lifestyle-based political issues such as being a vegetarian and what it means to be a 'good' parent. Political talk was not confined to any particular sub-forum. Indeed, it emerged in more than half of the forums under investigation from the Food Shopping & Groceries, Discount Codes 'n Vouchers and Pets & Pet Care forums to the Benefits & Tax Credits, Money Saving in Marriages, Relationships & Families and Money Saver Arms forums.

Arguing and debating, which represented 15% of the postings, was closely linked to political talk. The analysis revealed that when SP1s argued/debated, it was almost exclusively done during the course of a political discussion, representing 92% of these postings. But several questions remain: How deliberative were SP1s in these debates? Were they reciprocal, rational and critical? Did they use evidence to support their claims?

Overall, SP1s were broadly deliberative when engaging in political talk. As mentioned above, the level of reciprocity as a whole was high. When taking a closer look at the 77 political threads, we found that 87% of SP1s postings were coded as replies. These exchanges tended to be rational and critical in nature. In particular, the level of rationality was high; 86% of the claims made were reasoned as opposed to assertions (non-reasoned claims), indicating that being rational was the norm. There also was a high level of critical reflection; i.e. SP1s tended to be critical of other participant's claims, which represented 72% of their arguments; these threads hosted a diversity of opinions. Moreover, when SP1s posted arguments, nearly half provided evidence (facts/sources, examples, comparisons or personal experiences) in

support of their claims. One common practice was the use of personal experiences, as the

example below illustrates:

> I'm brilliant at managing my money - but I'll be honest. My child Tax Credits are spent on luxuries for my children - LIKE FOOD!!!! Like essential petrol to get him school -too far to walk both kids along roads with no pavement but car is ONLY used for school runs. Like "essential" clothing to keep them wind and water tight. There is no LUXURIES contingency in the tax Credit system just for basics.
>
> We have no spare income for activities at the moment - and if either of them need new shoes before the end of term I am scuppered because there is no excess in the budget.

In this debate, the participant was defending the child tax credit benefit from those who

thought it was being abused. As a means of supporting her argument, she uses her personal

experience of being on such benefits. In some of these cases, SP1s used their personal

experiences as an authoritative position to speak from, which is in line with similar studies on

third spaces (Author B, 2010, 2012; Van Zoonen, 2007; Van Zoonen et al., 2007).

The other two behaviours linked to political talk were interpreting/clarifying and

providing factual information, both of which were pedagogical in nature.

Interpreting/clarifying accounted for 7% of the postings. In these cases, SP1s would help

fellow participants by explaining, interpreting or clarifying the issues and topics under

discussion. The most common practice was clarifying (mis)information:

> Participant: They may still be entitled to something if they needed to help their OH, e.g. get in/out of the bath, dress themselves, with eating, etc. You don't have to be there 24/7.
>
> SP1: You are mistaken.
> To claim carers allowance (CA)the person you care for needs to get DLA middle rate care which means more than hours worth of care a day. The OP's husband does not even claim DLA at the moment.

As this example shows, SP1s acted as a form of quality control, correcting and clarifying information posted by other forum participants. They also helped others by explaining the arguments and positions being put forth. As the posting below illustrates, this sometimes included providing a summary of what the debate was about for newcomers or those who were having difficulties following the discussion:

> I've been reading through most of this thread, and I get the impression that it's moving a bit too fast for you and sometimes you can't keep up with the advice people are trying to give you, so I'll try and break it down. […]

They acted too as 'experts' by interpreting laws, rules and procedures on things such as consumer rights/laws, traffic and parking violations, health service claims and zoning regulations, as the example below shows:

> Participant: That's what this says - but what does "The road forks around the farm for engineering reasons owing to the surrounding area's geology," actually mean?
>
> SP1: It means what it says - the geology of the area meant building around the farm was a cost effective solution. The Wiki entry photo doesn't show it very well, but the westbound carriageway is higher than the eastbound. The M6 at Shap also splits to accommodate the contours.

Finally, SP1s even provided interpretations of situations in other forum participant's lives:

> As a glasses wearer for nearly 30 years i think i have worked out what has happened regarding the OP situation [...]

On many of these occasions, SP1s would use their own life experiences as a mirror for explaining and interpreting events in other participant's lives. Overall, these findings support those of Rauch (1983) and Nonnecke and Preece (2003 – cited in Albrecht, 2006).

Not as common, but related to interpreting/clarifying, was the behaviour of providing (unsolicited) factual information. On occasions, SP1s dropped links to or articles/reports/information from news media, government or other institutions and organizations as a means of fuelling and enhancing the quality of debate.

The final cluster of behaviours identified by the analysis consisted of degrading and curbing, two negative behaviours commonly associated with online forums. Degrading (or flaming) – to lower in character, quality, esteem or rank another participant's post or person – is behaviour typically associated with online political talk (see e.g. Jankowski & Van Os, 2004; Strandberg, 2008; Tsaliki, 2002). Indeed, 86% of the postings coded as degrading occurred during the course of a political discussion. This is not surprising given the argumentative and aggressive nature of political talk. That said, such behavior impacts political talk in a negative way. For example, Jankowski and Van Os's interviews found that this type of communicative practice turned people away from the debates, negatively affecting access to the discussions. Curbing – an attempt to suppress, restrict or prevent another participant from raising an issue or voicing an opinion – was another negative behaviour identified by the analysis. Curbing here was typically directed at suppressing a particular position, topic and, on a few occasions, a type of behaviour (i.e. arguing/debating), as the examples below show:

Example 1: So far, you're the only one preaching on this thread. Why would you even want to come on to a thread about vegetarian food if you feel so persecuted?"

Example 2: I wonder when this thread is going to be allowed to die or is the playground rhetoric going to continue?"

Example 3: DD is a chef, she said judging by portions etc, £1.50 per day. 10 ladies on the SCBU ward so not a lot. And if it shuts you all up she would have happily paid the bl00dy £1.50. Now please go away!"

Like degrading, this behaviour seemed to be limited to political talk with 82% of curbing taking place within political threads. Overall, however, such practices – degrading and curbing – were infrequent, accounting for only 3% of the postings.

Conclusion

This article has attempted to illuminate an under-researched area of online forum communication: the nature and impact of super-participants. We have developed a theoretically informed typology that we hope will help researchers to identify the presence of super-participants so that their activities can be subjected to detailed analysis. Our quantitative analysis identified 2052 SP1s. Super-posting was not, thus, the preserve of the few – though this was only 0.4% of all users – suggesting a long tail. Moreover, they made nearly 50% of all posts. They did, thus, quantitatively dominate debates. However, the qualitative content analysis has found that SP1s did not normally attempt to stop other users from posting (curbing) or attempt to attack them (flaming). They undertake a range of largely positive functions and roles within the forum, including helping other users; replying to debates and summarising longer threads for new users; being empathetic towards others' problems; and engaging in (largely) rational critical debate. The often humorous and familiar nature of debate suggests that this was a virtual community, and SP1s played a significant role in facilitating this. It seems as though, at least in this case, SP1s helped to create continuity and facilitated an inclusive environment. We argue, thus, in contradiction to most of the received wisdom, their role was largely positive; they were performing a similar role to Oldenburg's regulars. More generally, the analysis suggests that the MSE forum was a third space – with significant amounts and deliberatively constructed political talk; strong evidence of community; and reciprocal and altruistic activities.

References

Albrecht, S. (2006). Whose voice is heard in online deliberation? A study of participation

and representation in political debates on the Internet. *Information, Communication &*

Society, 9(1), 62-82.

Anstead, N. and O'Loughlin, B. (2011). The Emerging Viewertariat and BBC Question Time:

Television Debate and Real Time Commenting Online. *International Journal of*

Press/Politics, 16(4), 440-462.

Author A (2006)

Author A (2007)

Author A and (2007)

Author A (2012)

Author A (in press)

Author B (2008)

Author B (2009)

Author B (2010)

Author B (2012)

Awan, A. (2007). Virtual jihadist media: Function, legitimacy and radicalizing Efficacy.

European Journal of Cultural Studies, *10*(3), 389-408.

Basu, S. (1999). Dialogic ethics and the virtue of humor. *The Journal of Political*

Philosophy, *7*(4), 378-403.

Bua, A. (2012). Agenda setting and democratic innovation: The case of the

Sustainable Communities Act (2007). *Politics*, *32*(1), 10-20.

Chambers, S. (1996). *Reasonable democracy: Jurgen Habermas and the politics of*

discourse. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Cohen, J. (1997). Deliberation and democratic legitimacy. In J. Bohman & W. Rehg (Eds.),

Deliberative democracy: Essays on reason and politics (pp. 67-92). Cambridge, MA:

MIT Press.

Coleman, S., & Blumler. J. G. (2009). *The Internet and democratic citizenship.* Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Coleman, S., & Gøtze, J. (2001). *Bowling together: Online public engagement in*

policy deliberation. London: Hansard Society.

Dahlberg, L. (2001a). Computer-mediated communication and the public

Sphere: A Critical Analysis. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, 7*(1),

article 5.

Dahlberg, L. (2001b). The Habermasian public sphere encounters cyber-reality.

Javnost – The Public, 8(3), 83-96.

Davies T., & Peña Gangadharan, S. (Eds.). (2009). *Online deliberation: Design, research*

and practice (pp. 23–35). Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.

Davis, R. (2009). *Typing politics: The role of blogs in American politics*. Oxford:

Oxford University Press.

Davis, R. (2005). *Politics online: Blogs, chatrooms, and discussion groups in*

American democracy. London: Routledge.

Donath, J. S. (1999). Identity and deception in the virtual community. In P. Kollack & M. A.

Smith (Eds.), *Communities in cyberspace* (pp. 27-56). London: Routledge.

Dunne, K. (2009). Cross cutting discussion: A form of online discussion discovered

within local political online forums. *Information Polity, 14*(3), 219-232.

Edwards, A. (2002). The moderator as an emerging democratic intermediary: The role

of the moderator in Internet discussions about public issues. *Information Polity, 7*(1),

3–20.

Golder, S. A. (2003). *A typology of social roles in Usenet.* (Unpublished thesis). Harvard

University, Cambridge, MA.

Himelboim, I., Gleave, E., & Smith, M. (2009). Discussion catalysts in online

    political discussions: Content importers and conversation starters. *Journal of*

    Computer-Mediated Communication, 14(4), 771-789.

Hindman, M. (2009). *The myth of digital democracy.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton

    University Press.

Jankowski, N. W., & Van Os, R. (2004). Internet-based political discourse: A case

    study of electronic democracy in Hoogeveen. In P. Shane (Ed.), *Democracy Online*

    (pp. 181-194). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Kies, R. (2010). *Promises and limits of Web-deliberation*. Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave.

Kim, A. J. (2000). *Community building on the Web*. Berkeley, CA: Peachpit Press.

Kuperman, V. (2006). Productivity in the Internet mailing lists: A bibliometric analysis.

    JASIST, 57(1): 51-59.

Mayring, P. (2000). Qualitative content analysis. *Forum: Qualitative Social*

    Research, *1*. Retrieved from http://www.qualitative-

    research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1089

Oldenburg, R. (1999). *Great good place*. New York: Marlow.

Rauch, H. (1983). Partizipation und leistung in großgruppen-sitzungen. In F. Neidhardt (Ed.),

    Gruppensoziologie. Perspektiven und materialien (pp. 256–274). Westdeutscher

    Verlag, Opladen.

Smith, G. (2009). *Democratic innovations: Designing institutions for citizen participation*.

    Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sonnenbichler, A. C. (2010). *A community membership life cycle model*. Technical Report,

    Karlsruhe Institute of Technology.

Strandberg, K. (2008). Public deliberation goes on-line? An analysis of citizens' political

    discussions on the internet prior to the Finnish parliamentary elections in 2007.

    Javnost - The Public, 15(1), 71-90.

Tsaliki, L. (2002). Online forums and the enlargement of public space: Research findings

    from a European project. *Javnost - The Public, 9*(2), 95-112.

Turner, T.C., & Fisher, K. E. (2006). The impact of social types within information

    communities: Findings from technical newsgroups. *Proceedings of the 39th Annual*

    Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences 6, 135b.

Welser, H. T., Gleave, E., Fisher, D., & Smith, M. (2007). Visualizing the signatures

    of social roles in online discussion groups. *Journal of Social Structure, 8*(2).

Winkler, R. (2005). *Europeans have a say: Online debates and consultations in the*

    EU. Vienna: The Austrian Federal Ministry for Education, Science and Culture,

    Institute of Technology Assessment of the Austrian Academy of Sciences.

Van Zoonen, L. (2007). Audience reactions to Hollywood politics. *Media, Culture &*

    Society, *29*(4), 531-547.

Van Zoonen, L., Muller, F., Alinejad, D., Dekker, M., Duits, L., Van Romondt Vis, P., &

    Wittenberg, W. (2007). Dr. Phil meets the candidates: How family life and personal

    experience produce political discussions. *Critical Studies in Media Communication,*

    24(4), 322-338.

Viegas, F. B. & Smith, M. A. (2004). *Newsgroup crowds and author lines: Visualizing*

    the activity of individuals in conversational cyberspaces. Big Island, HI: IEEE.

Table 1 Number of Postings per Each of the 25 SP1s

25 SP1s	No. of posts	Percentage of postings
P1	55	3,2
P2	50	2,9
P3	81	4,8
P4	52	3,1
P5	68	4,0
P6	51	3,0
P7	50	2,9
P8	50	2,9
P9	51	3,0
P10	52	3,1
P11	51	3,0
P12	93	5,5
P13	89	5,2
P14	77	4,5
P15	51	3,0
P16	53	3,1
P17	59	3,5
P18	101	5,9
P19	89	5,2
P20	60	3,5
P21	55	3,2
P22	90	5,3
P23	70	4,1
P24	110	6,5
P25	91	5,4
Total	1699	100,0

Table 2 Average Posts per Day

Av. Posts Per Day	No. of SP1s
1-5	1691
6-10	256
11-20	85
21-50	19
50+	1

Table 3 Length of Membership (Days)

Length of Membership	No. of SP1s
0-2 Years	115
3-4 years	648
5-6 Years	828
7+	461

Table 4 How Number of Posts Affects Behaviour

No. of Posts	No. of SP1s	Av. Posts per day	Av. length of Membership (days)
2,000-4,999	1361	2	1640

|			
5,000-9,999	433	5	1742
10,000-14,999	136	7	1838
15,000-19,999	66	10	1954
20,000-29,999	30	15	1830
30,000-39,999	17	19	1974
40,000-49,999	3	21	2298
50,000+	6	43	1905

Table 5 Percentage of Posts Thanked

No. of SP1s	Percentage of Posts Thanked
0	0-25
6	26-50
11	51-75
8	76-100

Note: Data was collected 20 June 2012 due to a problem with the data originally collected.

Table 6 Average Number of Thanks per Post

Av. No. of thanks per post	No. of SPs
0-.99	3
1-1.99	11
2-2.99	3
3-3.99	0
4-4.99	1
5-9.99	6
10+	1

Note: Data was collected 20 June 2012 due to a problem with the data originally collected.

Figure 1 Overall SP1 posting behaviour in percentages

Notes

1   Attempts to predict or explain posting patterns and behaviour, such as Lotka's Law, were not specifically designed for the nature of online publishing and have been found to have limited success at predicting the distribution of publishing posts. For example, Kuperman (1996) found that there were dominant minorities in email lists, but that the lower publication barriers made Lotka's Law a poor fit with posting behaviour, but the Generalised Inverse Gaussian-Poisson and Poisson-lognormal distributions were strong fits. Other widely cited models, such as the Pareto Principle, under-predict the impact of the dominant minority.

2   We have chosen not to use the title of regulars because we believe this lacks specificity (see typology) and does not enable us to capture the different types of SP we identify.

3   See: www.big-boards.com - though this list is far complete, it is a useful indicator.

4   In the context of a third place, facilitators are similar to the pub landlord.

5   Sometime after this analysis was conducted, the forum was sold to Moneysupermarket.com for £87m.

6   Analysis conducted 21st August, 2011.

7   This has arguably become all the more important as the government has cut back its own consumer advice bodies and asked that the "Big Society" steps in to fill the gap.

8   The coding category *curbing* and *providing factual information* received .60 and .33 for Krippendorff's Alpha. The low scores here can be contributed to the infrequency of the two codes in the sample. For both, the average pairwise percentage of agree was 99%.

9   In a limited number of cases, personal information appeared false, or was intended to be a joke. No user gave each piece of personal information while six gave no personal information at all.

10   A posting was coded as a reply if it quoted another message; cited another participant; or it clearly interacted with the content of another posting.