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**Essay**

## Introduction

Web 2.0 was a modified in the way people used the Internet from the delivery of static information to a dynamic, interactive environment where users could generate content and collaborate interactively in real time (O'Reilly, 2005). Of the many such platforms, Twitter most exemplifies the precepts of Web 2.0 because it can easily facilitate short-form, real-time exchanges that have brought collaboration and dialogue on a global scale. Introduced in 2006, the unique features of Twitter, such as hashtags and retweets, have been instrumental in the activation of social movements, the promotion of community development, and the sharing of information to an unprecedented extent (Gruzd, Wellman, & Takhteyev, 2011).

Despite its transformative potential, there are challenges that complicate Twitter's role in communication and collaboration. The example of misinformation, echo chambers, and trolling shows the complexity of keeping open and productive digital discourses (Lockett, 2021). The essay explores how Twitter as a Web 2.0 platform has reframed communication and collaboration. Through a critical analysis of its impact on activism, community building, and knowledge sharing, in addition to the challenges it presents, the essay examines how much Twitter has really changed the way people connect and collaborate around the world.

### **Overview of Web 2.0 and its Characteristics**

Web 2.0 was first spoken of as a concept around the years 2003-2004, in which the internet had to be used in a completely different way. The static Web 1.0 was replaced by a social and interactive internet, thanks to Web 2.0.

Web 2.0 is all about interactivity, user-generated content, and collaboration by users. The main technologies are social media, blogs, wikis, and interactive applications such as YouTube and Facebook, which allow sharing and collaboration in real time (FirstMonday.org, 2007).

Web 2.0 is characterised by two-way communication. Unlike Web 1.0, where users passively received content, Web 2.0 allows active participation in commenting and sharing. For instance, wikis let multiple users edit and add to content, marking a shift from one-way publishing to interaction, as Laningham (2006) notes:

Although Web 2.0 utilises the same underlying technologies as Web 1.0, it is a shift in approach. It adopts "glue" technologies like APIs and mashups to stick platforms and services together smoothly. This has brought about significant diversity in the types of content and enriched users' experiences (FirstMonday.org, 2007).

This evolution brings challenges. As the Web becomes more interactive, concerns about data privacy, misinformation, and responsible user-generated content rise. These are critical thinking and innovative solutions that need to be developed with the evolution of the web.

### **Twitter’s Role in Communication Transformation**

Since its debut in 2006, Twitter has revolutionised communication with its short-form messaging and global reach. Twitter allows users to share real-time updates in a concise manner, originally within a limit of 140 characters (now 280). By the year 2013, it had over 200 million active users who posted 400 million tweets every day, linking people and communities around the globe (Weller et al., 2014). The success of a platform depends on such functionalities as hashtags, which users invented to classify content and make complex networks possible.

The global influence of Twitter exceeds distance and language. It operates in 33 languages, enabling connections among divergent groups. This facilitates real-time news sharing. During global crises, Twitter provides timely updates that connect affected people with aid organisations (Weller et al., 2014).

Activism in many instances needs a catalyst that is Twitter for the mobilisation of movements as witnessed with #BlackLivesMatter, which began in the U.S. and became a global push for change (Frosch & Calvert, 2015). Organisations such as the Red Cross utilise Twitter for viral campaigns and raising funds (Briones et al., 2011). Twitter's speed and reach help grassroots movements and charities gain traction.

Apprehensions about misinformation and “slacktivism” continue. Critics argue that digital activism on Twitter often reduces participation to superficial actions, like liking or sharing, which lack real engagement (Davies, 2013). Nonetheless, Twitter remains a transformative force for global communication and cooperation.

### **Twitter’s Role in Collaboration and Community Building**

Unlike Facebook or LinkedIn, Twitter was built around the sharing first and foremost of information, rather than community-building (Gruzd, Wellman, & Takhteyev, 2011). Nevertheless, this has gradually emerged as a force in collaboration and the building of on-line communities. Twitter connects individual people, other organisations, governments, and entire entities, joining conversations and collaborations transcending geographical boundaries across the world.

Movements like #BlackLivesMatter are the epitome of how Twitter facilitates global advocacy. Starting in the U.S., this hashtag was able to join voices around the world in the efforts toward social change through protest and policymaking (Frosch & Calvert, 2015). The Red Cross, among other organisations, has utilised this characteristic of Twitter for crowdsourcing ideas and gathering resources during disasters and other emergencies (Briones et al., 2011).

Communities of Practice (CoPs) rely on shared values and working together. They do well on Twitter because of features like hashtags and retweets. CoPs use Twitter to share knowledge, create resources, and connect in learning groups (Wenger-Trayner, 2015). Tools like Twitter improve these interactions by allowing members that are geographically apart to communicate well and develop their common purposes further (Amin & Roberts, 2006).

Twitter has helped promote learning and activism, proving the service is about more than a way to send a message by enabling people to work together, which creates common understandings: in ways once impossible, allows different groups to come to shared goals.

### **Challenges and Criticisms of Twitter**

While Twitter has revolutionised the way people communicate, it also faces significant problems and criticisms. The most prominent is misinformation dissemination. Real-time features often amplify the spread of unverified claims, putting people in so-called echo chambers where they get only information that supports their already existing beliefs (Lockett, 2021). This further fuels polarisation and hinders productive discourse, particularly on controversial issues like politics and public health.

One major issue is that of trolling and online harassment. Public figures, such as student-athletes, are far more vulnerable to targeted abuse. Research into NCAA Division I athletes has shown that they regularly receive abusive tweets from fans, for which they have to develop strategies to deal with internet abuse (Browning & Sanderson, 2012). This shows that there has to be a development of proactive programs by the institutions to help the vulnerable users navigate through their online presence.

The policies Twitter has put in place around content moderation raise huge concerns. While such regulations are aimed at curbing hurtful content, they often unleash debates on issues of free speech. Critics argue that bans or content removals can disproportionately target specific groups or perspectives, thus leading to claims of bias. At the same time, lax enforcement can leave hate speech rampant, further compounding Twitter's situation as a neutral platform (Lockett, 2021).

Despite such challenges, communities like Black Twitter show the potential that the platform holds for social change. Hashtags like #BlackLivesMatter amplify the voices of the margins, speaking to systemic issues such as racism (Lockett, 2021). But with that power comes danger, because malicious campaigns can harness those very same features.

### **Comparison of WEB2 principles and Twitter evolution**

Twitter is an embodiment of the concepts of Web 2.0, since it emphasizes user-generated content, promotes interactivity, and encourages participation. Being an online platform, it allows for posting short messages—otherwise known as tweets—thereby allowing real-time engagement and interaction among users. Further, functionalities such as retweets, replies, and hashtags allow for content creation and sharing while directly participating in global conversations (Gruzd et al., 2011). In its ability to connect people, organizations, and communities, Twitter exemplifies the collaborative and networked nature associated with Web 2.0 technologies.

However, Twitter does not follow all Web 2.0 ideas. While Web 2.0 encourages everyone to join in equally, Twitter’s algorithms focus on popular content, often highlighting some voices while pushing others aside. This leads to echo chambers, where users see only content that matches their views, which goes against the open and varied communication that Web 2.0 wants to create (Lockett, 2021).

Furthermore, its commercial model of relying on targeted advertising can supersede authentic interactions. According to critics, because of monetization strategies that often value engagement over user well-being, much sensational or outright malicious content abounds. If Web 2.0 espouses user empowerment, these limitations put in sharp focus the need for Twitter, a commercial enterprise, to balance its dual role: being a medium of communication versus being a for-profit business enterprise.

Despite these hurdles, Twitter remains a significant example of Web 2.0, demonstrating its transformative potential while also enlightening areas for development.

## Conclusion

(Puropse- summaries argument, reinforce thesis)

(Structure- restate thesis, summarise main focus, call for acgion, or broder allocation)
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