To what extent have an understanding of fandom and public opinion  
Transformed in the age of web.2.0. Critically explore these transformations through  
specific case studies or examples

Introduction

In this essay, the uses of fandoms and public opinions will be discussed and how they have transformed the age of web 2.0. A fandom is a subculture composed of fans characterised by a feeling of empathy and camaraderie with others who share a common interest. Public opinion is the collective opinion on a specific topic or voting intention relevant to society. (Datta, 2022)

Fandoms usually begin with a Weblog, a new and widespread phenomenon that is thought to have the potential to increase citizen participation in the media, particularly in creating media content by 'netizens' (Hauben, 1995). A blog can be characterised as an online journal that allows the author(s) to share their opinions on various topics with a potentially worldwide audience, but more often local or micro-public, while also involving the audience in responding to and interacting with the blogger's material. These web blogs, more known nowadays as “vlogs,” shape the internet as influencers grow, spread their opinions, and create fandoms or worse “, stans.”

The conventional line between amateur and professional producers of media content is gradually eroding, according to current debates on blogging and interactive media in general. In this sense, Allan (2002, p. 127) characterises blogging as "personalised journalism," with features such as first-hand eyewitness accounts and a two-way communication process between content providers and consumers. Gilmour (2006, p. 18) refers to a "conversational model of journalism" powered by blogs and citizen journalists. It is hardly surprising that some authors have linked blogs to the history of public journalism by referring to them as "public journalism" (Witt, 2004; Hass, 2005). In a similar vein, MacKinnon (2004, p. 10) proposes that instead of using the term "public," one should use the words "information community.". This presents Web 2.0 to a sociological audience as an example of a cultural digitalisation process going faster than our ability to analyse it.

Fandoms include examples “*of wikis, folksonomies, mashups, social networking sites, and, where possible, as an example, cases in which sociology and sociologists are featured”.* Carr (2005) and Keen (2007). The paper will discuss three agendas for how there is a sustainable Web 2.0: As these new web apps become more prevalent in everyday life, sociologists are working to establish sociological understandings of new online cultures. The emergence of a new 'Power of influence ' discourse and the mainstreaming of the internet culture transforms.

Power of influence

Large media corporations and venture investors have taken over the most prominent blog hosting services and social networking sites in recent years. YouTube, the leading video blog or vlog site, was also purchased by Google. Carr (2005) and Keen (2007). Microsoft owns a share in Facebook. This began the social media we have today and, by extensions, more social media sites such as Meta and Twitter. Carr (2005) and Keen (2007).

This demonstrates how eager the leading media players “*are to position themselves in the new digital terrain, where the "customer" has also become a "creator."* Carr (2005) and Keen (2007). Furthermore, big media companies have launched their vlog services, allowing readers to publish their blogs or view them on YouTube.

It can be seen everywhere regarding fandoms, from any YouTube community like Dream stans to music like K-Pop to games like Undertale. All come in different forms; some are toxic some are not so toxic. They all play a part in building the web and forming public opinion around certain things. Political and cultural users are increasingly keeping their blogs. Web surfers benefit much from such a blog regarding self-promotion, public relations, and propaganda methods. Carr (2005) and Keen (2007).

In addition, there are two mutually reinforcing elements to consider here. First, a blog allows. Because it will enable them (or their spokespersons) to communicate directly with their fans, supporters, sympathisers, or even opponents without the need for intermediaries or the risk of their words and messages being twisted or "spun" by a journalist, creators to disseminate their ideas (and "cultural products") outside of the mainstream media. The audience of influencer blogs includes mainstream journalists, who have risen to the position of power and influence, and politicians like Doland Trump through the use of Twitter initially and now on a new social media, “True Social.”

The mainstream media is more likely to notice the blog and publish a snippet or a link, providing the elite blog, politicians, etc., even more exposure and publicity. Because of these two mutually reinforcing methods, cultural, political, and economic content creators are increasingly using blogs. On the one hand, there is a pull movement in which admirers, sympathisers, and others are lured to a political and cultural idol's blog. On the other hand, a push movement promotes messages, music, and other content placed on the blog through mainstream media and backlinks on other blogs to other media sites. (Drezner & Farrell, 2004). Aside from "known" influencers, the blogosphere itself develops new celebs as a result of the current "cult of the amateur," as Carr (2005) and Keen (2007) describe it. In the blogosphere, the hierarchy has given rise to what is known as A-list bloggers, who distinguish between norms and ethical rules" (Keen, 2007, p. 52).

Discourse

Due to social networking via Twitter and Facebook. Direct and easily accessible consumer-to-consumer communication, enabled by social networking, serves as a repository of information from one's referent group and a company's customer-facing facade. As a result, as customer connections get stronger, customers assume greater brand ownership at the expense of corporate marketing attempts to build a distinct brand.

Writers on the subject of fan studies have recently reintroduced John Fiske's seminal work, partly in response to debates concerning participatory culture and what has been dubbed "web 2.0." (1992). A three-part model of semiotic, enunciative, and textual production was developed to theorise online fandom. (e.g., Crawford 2012; Sandvoss 2011; Scott 2008).

This essay will observe the challenges in thinking through democratisations using Fiske's (pre-Internet) model of fan productivity on web 2.0. To begin with, what constitutes a 'text' in a world where comments, tweets, and status updates can all be considered types of fannish textual communication.

Fiske's three categories may be cycled through quickly and easily, increasing productivity. Thanks to social media, have we become hybridised? Second, to what extent does Fiske's unwillingness to participate in the investigation impact the outcome? What is the difference between 'fan' and 'fandom'?

Gauntlett (2011) and Shirky (2011) argue that fan creation without knowledge is problematic (e.g., Gauntlett 2011; Shirky 2011) as well as those who are equally problematically and strive to reclaim their old identity. There is amateur vs. professional (e.g., Keen 2008; Lanier 2011). Several examples, such as Twitter users, show that problems of competence and differentiation are still significant to fans. As a result, both the cultural-political successors to Fiske's 'active audience' are challenged.

Finally, the affordances and activities of digital fandom are simply a trend. They return us to Fiske's own semiotic, enunciative, and textual production. There is a lot of trepidation about these labels, and it is essential to remember that we shouldn't just apply them. Digital fandom is divided into several categories.

Fiske's perspective on the "active audience” and their opponents' dismissive attitude toward fans’ inventiveness. However, I believe that a "return to Fiske" can be beneficial in highlighting various links between fan expertise and the democratisation of production enabled by web 2.0. Rather than being a dialectic or paradox, it is controlled through fan-cultural moral codes and monetary systems (Jenkins, Ford and Green 2013).

Online forums can also be problematic. Stormfront and Blood&Honour are examples of how online forms can be problematic; some models feature subsites in different languages, allowing far-right and fascist militants throughout Europe to employ racist vocabulary and disseminate Holocaust denial content in their native tongue. The Belgian anti-racist and anti-discrimination statutes (1981/2003) and the act banning negationism specifically criminalise much of what is posted on these sites (1995). Following the murder of Nigerian au-pair Oulematou Niangadou and Luna Drowart, the baby she was caring for, by an extreme-right adolescent in Antwerp's inner city, explicitly racist discourses were posted on the Stormfront site. (May 2006).

Mainstreaming

The act of production, especially in the case of social networking sites, produces a situation in which private information becomes open and accessible to anybody with Internet access. As confidential information is made public, thoughts, opinions, education/employment information, personal images, and so on become available. Indeed, one could consider this to represent a broader trend linked with new technology that needs the codification of habit in ever-more-detailed ways (Burrows and Gane, 2006). This is a fascinating shift in how individuals regard privacy for such information since wikizens are prepared to share some of their most personal data with the public. This, of course, involves issues such as the shifting relationships between internet content generation and consumption.

According to a recent study of MIT students' Facebook information sharing and protection, "Facebook has firmly rooted in college student’s lives*, “but users had not regulated who had access to this section of their lives"* (Jones and Soltern, 2005: 4). Furthermore, the researchers discovered that "third parties were actively seeking information" (Jones and Soltern, 2005: 4). However, these conceptions of 'common sense' have altered with changes in perceptions and attitudes surrounding privacy. We do not see much effort to keep information hidden regarding fandoms and social media. Instead, the emphasis is on disclosing as much information as possible to nurture the projected picture that the user intends to cultivate.

However, a more general issue here is that as individuals participate in creating or generating information, they make a freely accessible archive of their 'daily life.' In an age of 'knowing capitalism,' where data-mining and prediction technology are prevalent, this type of knowledge about preferences, decisions, and other personal aspects is necessary. (Burrows and Ellison, 2004) or people looking for 'love' (Suna et al., 2006) that are being sorted and matched any longer — something far more generic. This is when the current browsing features come in handy—choosing the 'advanced' setting.

Finally, Web 2.0 has been heralded by what may be described as 'democratisation rhetoric.' This is characterised by stories and pictures of "the people" reclaiming the Internet and seizing control of its content, a form of "people's internet" or, less positively, the emergence of the amateur cult (Keen, 2007).

“*This, we are encouraged to believe, has resulted in a new collaborative, participatory, or open culture in which anyone can participate and be seen or heard. According to this vision, there are opportunities for our ideas to be heard, our videos to be viewed, and our music to be heard”.* (Keen, 2007).

Understanding how this discourse is produced requires a detailed and critical investigation. The strength of new fandoms and industries; the challenges and subversions given by collaborative culture; social involvement patterns; the emergence of new 'in-crowds'; the operations of new viral marketing methods; and who gets heard above the Web 2.0 cacophony. Despite the rhetoric of "democratisation," Web 2.0 is, as we have seen, a commercial and poorly regulated business.

In closing, we can see how fandoms and public opinion spread through the internet and create discourse, power of influence and mainstreaming throughout social media and form even data mining and creates a lack of privacy as the web 2.0 transforms, with can then be used for good or malicious purposes. It would seem to be that there may be a need to look further and study social media for us to be able to form a better environment and reduce toxicity from social media influencers and fandoms that affect the web 2.0 and said blogosphere.
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